

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

of the Protestant Episcopal Church



SEPTEMBER, 1958



EDITORIALS

On the Threshold of a Victory! . . . Associate Editor Murphy Honored! . . . A Tribute from the Archdeacon of Western New York . . . "Guide to Photocopied Historical Materials"

TWO ANGLICAN APPROACHES TO UNITY

- I. Some Relations Between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, 1896-1926
- II. The Relations Between the Anglican and Old Catholic Churches

By Duncan Van Doren

THE PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENT CHURCH (Iglesia Filipina Independiente)

By Norman S. Bland

THE FOUNDING OF THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE SOUTHWEST

By William A. Clebach

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY: \$1.25, THE COPY—\$5, THE YEAR

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

of the Protestant Episcopal Church



PUBLISHED AT 5 PATERSON STREET, NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY, BY AUTHORITY OF GENERAL CONVENTION, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A JOINT COMMISSION OF SAID CONVENTION, AND UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

CANON WALTER H. STOWE, S.T.D.
5 PATERSON STREET, NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

REV. DUBOIS MURPHY, D.D.
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

REV. WILLIAM W. MANTOR, PH.D.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

PROF. FRANK J. KLINGBERG, PH.D.
Los Angeles, California

PROF. RICHARD G. SALOMON, PH.D.
Cincinnati, Ohio

RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS, D.D.
San Francisco, California

CANON C. RANKIN BARSTOW, S.T.D.
New York City

REV. EDWARD R. HARRY, PH.D.
New Haven, Connecticut

REV. EDWARD H. ECKH, S.T.D.
Tulsa, Oklahoma

JOINT COMMISSION OF GENERAL CONVENTION

RT. REV. WALTER H. GRAY, D.D., *Chairman*

REV. CANON WALTER H. STOWE, S.T.D., *Vice-Chairman*

REV. CANON C. RANKIN BARSTOW, S.T.D., *Secretary*

RT. REV. THOMAS N. CARRUTHERS, D.D.

REV. WILLIAM W. MANTOR, PH.D.

RT. REV. NELSON M. BURROUGHS, D.D.

COL. JACKSON A. DYKMAN, S.C.L.

RT. REV. HENRY H. SHIRES, S.T.D.

PROF. FRANK J. KLINGBERG, PH.D.

REV. G. MACLAREN BAYTON, D.D.

PROF. RICHARD G. SALOMON, PH.D.

LAWRENCE F. LOWMAN, PH.D.

PUBLICATION AND EDITORIAL OFFICE: 5 PATERSON ST., NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.
Address all subscriptions to HISTORICAL MAGAZINE as above. Five Dollars per year
in advance for subscriptions within the U. S. A. Six Dollars per year in advance
for foreign subscriptions. Checks should be drawn payable to HISTORICAL
MAGAZINE.

All communications and manuscripts for publication, including books and
pamphlets for review, to be addressed as above. The editors are not responsible for
the accuracy of the statements of contributors.

Entered as second-class matter September 17, 1935, at the Post Office at New
Brunswick, N. J., with additional entry at the Post Office at
Lebanon, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

of the Protestant Episcopal Church



Vol. XXVII SEPTEMBER, 1958 No. 3



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
EDITORIALS	178
On the Threshold of a Victory! . . . Associate Editor Murphy Honored! . . . A Tribute from the Archdeacon of Western New York . . . "Guide to Photocopied Historical Materials."	
TWO ANGLICAN APPROACHES TO UNITY	182
I. Some Relations Between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, 1896-1926	
II. The Relations Between the Anglican and Old Catholic Churches	
<i>By Duncan Van Dusen</i>	
THE PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENT CHURCH (Iglesia Filipina Independiente)	209
<i>By Norman S. Binsted</i>	
THE FOUNDING OF THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE SOUTHWEST	247
<i>By William A. Clebsch</i>	

Editorials

On the Threshold of a Victory!



ONE of the objectives of HISTORICAL MAGAZINE since its inception twenty-seven years ago—at the General Convention of 1931—has been to combat the philosophy of economic determinism under which so much American history has been written by those who call themselves professional historians. That this has not been “tilting at windmills” is evidenced by the statement of Professor William Warren Sweet, for many years at the University of Chicago, who has himself rendered outstanding service in this cause. In the preface to his *Religion in Colonial America*,* Professor Sweet states:

The growing interest in American cultural history renders a larger understanding of the religious development of America a necessity. The attempt to appraise American culture apart from religion is a contradiction in itself, for culture has to do with the moral and religious as well as the intellectual life of a society. Until recent years this phase of American history, outside New England, was not only neglected, it was minimized and even despised by some who liked to think of themselves as trained historians. For the last generation and more, a majority of our historians have been economic determinists, and consequently stressed our materialistic development to the neglect of those matters which have to do with the mind and the spirit. No nation of the world has had its political and economic life so fully analyzed as has ours; on the other hand, no great people of modern times have been so neglectful of the spiritual and idealistic phase of their development.

A generation ago a doctor's dissertation on an American Church history subject was unheard of in an American university. If such a thing had been proposed the student, doubtless, would have been told that it could not be accepted, since objectivity was impossible to achieve with such subjects. . . .

More and more, students in our colleges and universities are being allowed, and even encouraged, to do research in ecclesiastical subjects under the guidance of the professional historians who control the departments of history therein. There is, then, a growing admission that “a larger understanding of the religious development of America” is

* (New York, Scribner's, 1942), p. viii.

necessary if there is to be a true and rounded appraisal of American culture.

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE has always maintained that denominational history could be fairly and objectively written, and, moreover, that it is the duty of every denomination to see to it that, as far as possible, scholarly research in its own history be carried on and the fruits thereof published. This requires the publication of historical journals such as ours. The existence of such journals encourages the productive historical scholar, and their absence discourages him.

The tremendous increase in the cost of printing during the past two decades, that is, since before World War II, has posed serious problems in starting such scholarly periodicals, and, once having started them, in maintaining them. But they can be started, and they can be maintained, if the will is there to have portrayed in our school and college histories "a true and rounded appraisal of American culture."

If the various denominations in America do not have enough faith in the importance of their own history to have that history written up, why should secular organizations have it? This being true, let the American Episcopal Church be concerned for the continuance of its HISTORICAL MAGAZINE.

WALTER H. STOWE

Associate Editor Murphy Honored!

THE Rev. DuBose Murphy, our senior Associate Editor (in point of length of service), was one of six receiving honorary degrees at the Centennial commencement of the University of the South on June 9th last. The degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred upon him.

Dr. Murphy is rector of Christ Church, Tuscaloosa, Alabama; president of the Board of Examining Chaplains of the Diocese of Alabama; and historiographer of the Province of Sewanee, in addition to his position on the staff of HISTORICAL MAGAZINE.

Dr. Murphy is a member of the class of 1918, University of the South, and served churches in Austin, Tyler, and El Paso, Texas, before going to Tuscaloosa in 1942. He once was director of the Bible Chair at the University of Texas, and from 1926 to 1937 he was secretary of the Diocese of Texas. He was a deputy to the General Convention in 1931, 1934, and 1940.

Dr. Murphy is the author of *A Short History of the Episcopal*

Church in Texas (1935), *Life in the Church* (1945), *From "Churches" to "Church"* (1956), in addition to his contributions to HISTORICAL MAGAZINE and the *Anglican Theological Review*.

We congratulate Dr. Murphy on this well merited honor!

W. H. S.

A Tribute from the Archdeacon of Western New York

THE Ven. Henry P. Krusen is Archdeacon of Western New York, and, under date of July 11th last, he wrote us in connection with the renewal of his subscription:

I have never missed reading every issue of HISTORICAL MAGAZINE from cover to cover for about fifteen years, and you may be assured that my renewal will always be forthcoming—so don't ever take me off your list.

This unsolicited testimonial is very heart-warming to us, especially since we know Archdeacon Krusen and have a high regard for his ability.

W. H. S.

"Guide to Photocopied Historical Materials"

THE American Historical Association is preparing a *Guide to Photocopied Historical Materials in the United States and Canada*, under a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc. The *Guide* will be a desk reference book, paralleling the *Guide to Historical Literature*, that will tell where to find important bodies of microfilmed and other photocopied materials and how to use and procure them. It is expected to be published late in 1959.

The Association's Committee on Documentary Reproduction, with the assistance of an Advisory Committee of experts from the Library and Archival field, is supervising the collection of materials and editing. In this work the Archives section of the Canadian Historical Association is cooperating. The *Guide* will locate photocopied holdings of historical manuscripts by standard union list practices, according to traditional subject and period fields of history. This information is now being collected through cooperation with archives, libraries, and historical societies in both countries. Duplication of effort is currently avoided

through the exchange of reports with the *Union List of Microfilms*. The method of preparing the text anticipates the possible issuance of supplements.

The editor solicits the aid of historians in both countries in the discovery and accurate description of holdings of photocopied manuscripts wherever they may be. He welcomes information that will assist him in making the *Guide* as complete as possible. The editor is Dr. Richard W. Hale, Jr. Please address correspondence to him at: Boston University, Copley Square Campus, 84 Exeter Street, Room 401, Boston 16, Massachusetts.

Two Anglican Approaches To Unity

By Duncan Van Dusen*

I.

Some Relations Between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, 1896—1926

AT no time in the history of Western Christendom has the reunion of Christendom been more essential than it is today, as the Church is under attack from all sides. One of the Western World's greatest resources is its religion, and its religion can be much more effective if united. It is essential to think about the possibility of a closer understanding between the Anglican and the Roman Catholic Churches, and it is impossible to think constructively about it without a knowledge of their recent relations. It is only with this historical insight in mind that we can understand the perplexities that mar the pathway to a united Western Catholic Christendom.

Church history has usually been written in terms of the divisions among Christians, instead of in terms of the overriding necessity for recovering the lost unity of the Church. Even today, when there are many discussions about the Ecumenical Movement, the possibility of a rapprochement between the Anglican and the Roman Catholic Churches is seldom mentioned. Most churchmen seem to take it for granted that such a rapprochement is impossible, and very few people are aware of the discussions that the two Churches have had towards this end. Yet the committee of the Lambeth Conference that wrote the "Appeal to All Christian People" in 1920 stated in its report that we must all recognize :

"the fact that there can be no fulfillment of the Divine Purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are still bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. . . ."

This article is an examination of two important events concerning the two Churches that occurred during the three most significant decades in modern Church history (1896-1926). It is only by examining

* The author recently graduated from Princeton University, and is now serving in the Armed Forces of our country.—*Editor's note.*

these events and their historical roots that we can understand the legacy of the past and see something of the rugged journey ahead.

The Background

These three significant decades started with Pope Leo XIII's (1878-1903) bull, *Apostolicae Curae* (September 13, 1896), which condemned the validity of Anglican Orders, and they ended with the Conversations at Malines (1921-1926). However, there were three hundred and sixty years between 1534 and 1896, and why wasn't the schism healed during those years? There are naturally many reasons that can be stated in answer to this question, and it is necessary to mention four of the most important ones.

In the first place, Protestantism crept into the Church of England after the death of Henry VIII in 1547. Henry VIII was succeeded by his frail ten-year-old infant son, Edward VI (1547-1553), who was naturally unable to take personal charge of the situation. His uncle, the duke of Somerset, was appointed Lord Protector. In 1550, Somerset fell from power and was succeeded by the duke of Warwick. Both of these men had strong Protestant leanings, so that by the death of Edward VI, in 1553, the Church of England had been infiltrated by the Protestant ideas currently in vogue on the Continent.

This had two long range effects on the possibility of a reconciliation with Rome. In the first place, Protestant teachings are so anti-Roman Catholic that they cannot help but inculcate in their recipients strong feelings against the Roman Catholic Church, and, consequently, a definite lack of sympathy for any proposed cooperation with it. Secondly, Protestantism by its very nature tends to be schismatic. Once you get outside the realm of the Christian Church, where there is a definite hierarchical structure that rests not only on a jurisdictional but also on a sacramental basis, you get schisms. The number of Protestant denominations (about 300 now) in the United States is adequate testimony to this fact.

The whole Protestant conception of the ministry is more functional than structural. The introduction of Protestantism into England, therefore, emphasized the importance of the function of the Church, and diverted men's minds and interests from the question of the unity of the structure of the Church, and more particularly from the unity of Western Catholic Christendom.

It was not until the Oxford Movement had revived the Catholic ideas of the nature of the Church that it was possible to think of a rapprochement with Rome. The great Oxford reformers revived throughout England the concept of the Church that was held by the rest of the

Catholic world. These ideas influenced the whole Church of England, and with them went a great deal of emphasis on the Anglican Church's duty towards the rest of Catholic Christendom.

The second reason for the long period of separation was that there was a great deal of intolerance in England during this period. Queen Mary (1553-1558) was a devout Roman Catholic, and she attempted to reinforce Roman jurisdiction and beliefs throughout the country. This led to the beginning of a violent anti-Roman Catholic reaction, which lasts until the present day. When Bloody Mary died in 1558, she was succeeded by Elizabeth I, who formulated the famous Elizabethan Settlement that compounded elements of Catholicism and of Protestantism into a glorious formula which is now the doctrine of the Church of England.

The question immediately arises as to why an arrangement was not made for England to return to Rome under Queen Elizabeth. Historians have formulated many reasons in answer to this question, but the basic reason is that neither side wanted a rapprochement badly enough to make the necessary sacrifices. There are at last four reasons for this. There was, as we have seen, an anti-Roman Catholic reaction in England that began under Edward, and was strengthened under Mary. Secondly, the pope was still in close alliance with the Spaniards, and Philip II (1556-1598), the king of Spain, had been the husband of Queen Mary, who, because of her executions, was not very popular among Englishmen of her time. Thirdly, there were the Church lands, which were an important source of income for the crown and which Elizabeth I and the aristocracy had no desire to return to the pope. Lastly, a nationalistic sentiment had appeared in England, which accentuated the already existing intolerance of the Roman Catholic Church.

Pope Pius V (1566-1572) and the Roman Catholic Church were unwilling to make the necessary concessions to compensate for these factors working against a reconciliation. The fact that he hoped that some way might be found to bring England back under his jurisdiction is clearly shown by the date of the bull of excommunication. It was not until 1570, twelve years after the accession of Elizabeth I to the throne, that the bull was finally issued. The Great Schism that occurred in 1534 was not, therefore, finally consummated until 1570, and during this period the Anglican Church was adhering to forms and doctrines that the Roman Church was later to call heretical.

When the bull of excommunication finally came, it did little more than widen the gulf that separated the two Churches. It encouraged some of Elizabeth's subjects to try to overthrow her in favor of the Roman

Catholic, Mary, Queen of Scots. Eventually, the Spaniards attacked England, and in 1588 the great Spanish Armada was destroyed in the English Channel. National sentiment was aggravated, and intolerance continued to rise. Instead of coming closer together, the two Churches merely drifted further apart.

It is perhaps hard for us today to understand the intolerance of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. If one, however, is inwardly convinced he has the truth, as the men of this period generally were, how could you expect him to be particularly tolerant of what he considered to be error? Until the repeal of the Test Act in 1828 and the passage of the Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829, Roman Catholics were treated in an inferior manner in England. As Lord Halifax points out:

"What would the members of the Church of England have said if their Prayer Book had had to be disguised as the works of Horace or Vergil, or if they had been compelled, like a Lord Arundel of Wardour, to sell their carriage horses for five pounds apiece to the nearest neighbor, or, like Mr. Constable Maxwell of Everingham to pay double land tax, for the sake of their religious convictions?"¹

This prejudice was not only due to intolerance, but it was also due to a third factor that tended to separate the two Churches. This was the great fear of popery that grew up in England under the Stuarts. Queen Elizabeth I was succeeded by King James I (1603-1625), who was succeeded by King Charles I (1625-1642). Charles was beheaded on January 30, 1649, by the Puritans, united under Oliver Cromwell. Prejudice against Rome was further deepened by the indoctrination and nationalist sentiment of the Commonwealth period. The feeling of intolerance on the part of Roman Catholics towards the English was naturally deepened by the many heinous acts of Oliver Cromwell towards the Catholic faith, such as the Solemn League and Covenant (September 25, 1643).

Charles II returned from France in 1660 and was proclaimed king of England. The feelings against Roman Catholics were so strong at this time that Charles II was forced to conceal his leanings to Roman Catholicism in order to save his throne. When his brother, James II (1685-1688), who was overtly a Roman Catholic, succeeded him in 1685, such reaction was precipitated that James II fled England in 1688. The Glorious Revolution prevented any attempt at re-Roman Catholicizing of England, and it is a definite indication of how much prejudice against Rome had been built up.

Perhaps the best example, however, of this fear of popery was the

¹ John Gilbert Lockhart, *Viscount Halifax, Part II, 1885-1934* (London, 1936), 87.

Popish Plot in 1679. It was precipitated with a tract by Titus Oates on the likelihood of the Jesuits taking over England. Although clandestine diplomacy on the part of Charles II made the suspicion of Roman interference a justified fear, it could not possibly have had any other effect on the relations between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches than to create misunderstanding, and, therefore, broaden the already wide gulf.

Fourthly and lastly, it was the identification of Church and nation during these three hundred sixty years that kept the Anglican Church from wanting to attempt a rapprochement with Rome. This conception of the English Church as merely the religious aspect of the nation would inevitably prevent discussions with foreign churches. Archbishop Benson of Canterbury (1883-1897), for instance, refused "to take a private and unofficial line with secret agents from great powers,"² and therefore was reluctant to correspond with officials of the Roman Catholic Church.

Although this notion is still apparent, it is no longer as widely held. This can be largely accounted for by the world-wide status the Anglican Communion, attained by its spread in the nineteenth century, and secondly by the re-emphasis on the universal (Catholic) nature of the Church which came with the Oxford Movement. The Anglican Church was very fortunate to be taken to every corner of the globe by the imperialistic adventures of the British in the nineteenth century; and when the Church became established in other countries, it could no longer be conceived of as merely the religious aspect of England.

The doctrinal differences in themselves did not keep the two Churches from seeking a spirit of understanding and cooperation. They have merely appeared as barriers after the Churches have started talking with each other. These four factors prevented the Churches from ever getting together to find how far apart they were.

There were, however, two correspondences between the officials of the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches which must be mentioned. The first of these was in 1632, when there were private but encouraging communications between influential men in both Churches. The domestic troubles of the monarchy precluded any further development. Both Charles I and Archbishop Laud of Canterbury (1633-1645) were beheaded.

The second and most significant correspondence is that which Archbishop Wake of Canterbury (1716-1737) had with the French theologian, Dr. Louis E. Du Pin (1657-1719), between 1713-1715. Ultramontanism

² Bishop George Kennedy Allen Bell, *Christian Unity, The Anglican Position* (London, 1948), 69.

triumphed, and the correspondence was broken off after a notable approach towards agreement had begun.

The non-juror bishops who fled to Scotland at the time of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 have also always been in the forefront in discussing the subject of reunion with Rome. But this is another story, although we must be aware of their constant influence on the Church of England.³

As the old obstacles declined in importance, new obstacles arose. A Roman Catholic hierarchy was officially re-established in England in 1850, and in 1870 the Declaration of Papal Infallibility was made. At the Council of Trent (1545-1564) and at the Vatican Council in 1870, the Roman Catholics defined new dogmas which the Church of England could not accept.⁴ This is brought out clearly by the Conversations at Malines. However, the ecumenical ideals of the Oxford Movement inspired an English nobleman, Lord Halifax, to attempt twice to bring the Anglican and the Roman Catholic Churches together, and it is only by examining these attempts that we can understand the legacy of the recent past for the present.

"*Apostolicae Curae*" and Anglican-Roman Relations

On September 13, 1896, Pope Leo XIII published *Apostolicae Curae*, declaring "that Ordinations carried out according to the Anglican rite have been and are absolutely null and utterly void." Much has been written about the circumstances leading to this unfortunate end, and I am not going to recapitulate the immediate events preceding it, as it is more important to attempt to put the document in historical perspective.

The first question that must inevitably be asked about the bull is why it happened to be issued in the first place. It was provoked in two ways. In the first place, the Anglicans, and more particularly Lord Halifax, provoked Rome into making an inquiry into Anglican orders in the hope that the inquiry would be a first step towards a series of discussions on reunion. In the second place, the English Roman Catholics provoked the decision on the negative side, once the inquiry was initiated.

Lord Halifax intended the issue to be a convenient point of contact between the two Churches, and he also hoped that once this irritating point was favorably settled there would be a discussion of the real differences between Rome and Canterbury. Things, however, turned out differently, and the door to further discussions was slammed shut and remained so for twenty-five years.

³ See T. A. Lathebury, *History of the Non Jurors* (London, 1845).

⁴ See S.P.C.K. *Infallible Fallacies*, pp. 27-32.

The problem of Anglican orders is for many people a difficult one to sympathize with. This is undoubtedly because the problem seems to many people unimportant, and for those to whom it appears important there is every indication that they are valid, despite what the Roman Catholic Church says.

The problem of Anglican orders is in many ways a false problem. Why should Roman Catholics suppose that the Anglican laity would doubt the validity of the orders of the clergy who administer the sacraments to them any more than Roman Catholics would doubt the validity of the orders of the clergy who administer the sacraments to them? How could anybody then expect the Anglican laity to act differently than the Roman Catholics do? Even if one considers the problem of Anglican orders to be a false problem, they are still an historical problem, and one which is important in the relations between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches. It is because it was the issue discussed in a major attempt to effect a rapprochement that it must not be ignored.

Obviously, if one does not think a rapprochement between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches is desirable, one will not be very sympathetic to a discussion of the relation between the two Churches. Bishop Davidson of Rochester, later the Archbishop of Canterbury (1903-1928), stated in a letter to Lord Halifax:

"No man in England is more keen than I for such Reunion as is based upon *truth*. I long for it, and pray for it with all my heart. But I cannot at present share your hopes as to the way in which a real reunion of Christendom as a whole—not of the Roman and Anglican Churches only—is to be brought about. I fear on the contrary that anything which seems to advocate a corporate reunion between the Church of England and the unreformed Church of Rome may and will retard the grander reunion for which we hope and pray."⁵

If one agrees with Bishop Davidson, which I do, then one might be unsympathetic to the whole question of Anglican orders. Far in the discussions about Anglican orders, unlike the Conversations at Malines, the Roman Catholics appeared unwilling to make any compromises. The question was, therefore, that of reunion with an unreformed Roman Church, while at Malines the question was that of reunion with a Roman Church willing to make some concessions to the reformed Anglican Church. The whole matter was not what Lord Halifax intended it to be: "an introduction to the discussion of other questions involved in Reunion." Does all this mean that the rapprochement had failed?

⁵ The Bishop of Rochester to Viscount Halifax, as printed in G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury* (Oxford, 1952), 232.

By the world's standards, the rapprochement had failed. Not only had the Roman Catholics slammed the door against any discussion of other questions involved in reunion, but also antipathy and hard feelings had been stirred up among the Anglicans, who were naturally very much annoyed with the "gratuitous insult" that had been given to their Church. But as J. G. Lockhart points out, this judgment might be too harsh:

"Not merely the heroic episodes, but even the ultimate triumphs of history, have been born on some stricken field or in the shipwreck of some high endeavor. Nor may those who follow a religion, which draws its very life from the death of its Founder, dare to pass an easy verdict of failure upon those that have laboured honestly, selflessly, from the highest motives, and, for their time and generation, in vain."⁶

Why did they labour in vain? Lord Halifax sympathetically laid the blame on two people: Herbert Alfred Cardinal Vaughan, third Archbishop of Westminster (1892-1903), and his entourage, and Archbishop Edward White Benson of Canterbury (1883-1897).

It is not necessary to elaborate Lord Halifax's disappointment with Cardinal Vaughan, but it is necessary to emphasize Lord Halifax's sympathy with him. Lord Halifax reminded his friends that

"the Roman Catholic body has been treated under Penal Laws until comparatively recent times. Only so late as the year 1786, a Benedictine, Dom Anselm Botton, was tried at York for his life on the charge of High Treason for converting a girl to the Roman Catholic Faith."⁷

Lord Halifax also put a substantial share of the blame on Archbishop Benson. He said in *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders* that:

"Few men have ever had so great an opportunity offered to them as the Archbishop; no man, I think, ever so completely threw it away. On Cardinal Vaughan's shoulders rests the chief responsibility for the failure of all that was attempted, but a share of that responsibility must also rest on the shoulders of Archbishop Benson."⁸

Bishop G. K. A. Bell of Chichester comes to the archbishop's defense and further illustrates how far apart the two men's minds were.

⁶ J. G. Lockhart, *Viscount Halifax*, II, 86-87.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 87.

⁸ Viscount Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders* (London, 1912), 387-388; see also p. 125.

The bishop feels that

"It was a practical impossibility for the Archbishop of Canterbury to enter privately and unofficially into communication on such subjects with the authorities of another branch of the Church Catholic—especially when Cardinal Vaughan was at that very moment publicly declaring the absolute repudiation by Rome of Anglican Orders."⁹

There is less controversy about the role of Leo XIII in the whole affair. Lord Halifax's veneration for Leo XIII survived in undiminished force. On June 5, 1903, he saw Leo XIII for the last time, and "in the thought of what he had wished and attempted, the failure of that attempt, the pain and disappointments of the past were all forgotten."¹⁰ Even Mr. Snead Cox, Cardinal Vaughan's unsympathetic biographer, said that "the growing certainty that Anglican Orders could not escape condemnation must have come almost as a disappointment to Pope Leo."¹¹

But Lord Halifax's final view of the matter was not an assignment of responsibility for the failure of the rapprochement, but rather an optimistic hope. As J. G. Lockhart states:

"At least he believed that *Apostolicae Curae*, if it could not be set aside, could be explained, and in a fashion satisfactory to Anglicans, when the right moment arrived and the decision could be shown to rest upon an incomplete appreciation of the facts. This was a slender consolation; he found a more substantial advantage in the actual reopening of negotiations between the members of two Churches which, for more than three hundred years, had been at worst at war, and at best at armed neutrality; and yet another gain in the new attitude of Anglicans, who had explored their pedigree and learnt to put a new value on their birthright."¹²

Mr. Gladstone summed up the net effect of the whole matter slightly differently:

"On the positive side, after all that has happened during the last (nearly) four centuries, the spontaneous effort of a Pope to deal with a controverted matter in a spirit of approximation and of peace, was a step full of advantage to the cause of religion, and entitled the high person taking it to the warmest and most grateful acknowledgments. And negatively, an authoritative condemnation of what every Roman theologian has hitherto been free to support, would be a grave evil hardening and widening religious discord."¹³

⁹ G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson*, 230.

¹⁰ Viscount Halifax, *loc. cit.*, 426.

¹¹ J. G. Snead Cox, *The Life of Cardinal Vaughan* (London, 1919), II, 207.

¹² J. G. Lockhart, *Viscount Halifax*, II, 86.

¹³ W. E. Gladstone, *Gleanings of Past Years*, Vol. VIII, p. 142 as quoted in H. R. T. Brandreth, *Ecumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement* (London, 1947), 75.

Perhaps this is the fairest summary of the attempted rapprochement. But how authoritative was the bull?

Fr. Carson, the son of a Bedfordshire incumbent and a convert to Rome, in "On the Non-Infallible Dogmatic Force of the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*,"¹⁴ explained that the bull's subject-matter "failed to fulfill at least one of the conditions laid down by the Vatican Council, and since the nature of the document itself was such as could not come within the scope of the infallible pronouncements . . . any attempt to declare the Bull infallible was false."

Fr. Carson also pointed out that the last paragraph of *Apostolicae Curae* was identical with the last paragraph of Pope Clement XIV's (1764-1774) *Dominus ac Redemptor Noster* (July 21, 1773), which suppressed the Jesuits. Both last paragraphs stated:

"We decree that these Letters and all things contained therein shall not be liable at any time to be impugned or objected to by reason or fault or any other defect whatsoever of subreption or obreption of Our intention, but are and shall be always valid and in force, and shall be inviolably observed both juridically and otherwise, by all of whatsoever degree and pre-eminence, declaring null and void anything which in these matters may happen to be contrariwise attempted, whether wittingly or unwittingly, by any person whatsoever by whatsoever authority or pretext, all things to the contrary notwithstanding."¹⁵

Fr. Carson observes that *Dominus ac Redemptor Noster* "is a dead letter today, and such, it is devoutly to be hoped in the interests of Christian unity, may be the fate, in God's good providence, of the equally peremptory Bull *Apostolicae Curae* of Pope Leo XIII."¹⁶ Maybe the hopes of Lord Halifax and Fr. Carson may yet some day be fulfilled.

Canon Lacey wrote some few years later that the closed door had not stopped people thinking about reunion.

"It must be admitted that people have almost ceased to speak of Union; since the promulgation of the Bull which condemns Anglican ordinations (1896), it has been almost impossible to treat the subject beneficially and openly. But people have not ceased to think about it. If the *present opportunity* [sic] of union is slight indeed, if we agree to recognize that the means by which it will come about are hidden from us, the *ultimate necessity* [sic] of this union is no longer seriously questioned by anyone."¹⁷

¹⁴ Published as an appendix to his book *Reunion Essays* (London, 1903).

¹⁵ The Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII, *Apostolical Curae*, as printed in S.P.C.K., *Anglican Orders*, p. 15.

¹⁶ Carson, *Reunion Essays*, 252.

¹⁷ Art, "La Situation présente de l'Eglise d'Angleterre" in *Revue Catholique des Eglises*, March, 1908, as quoted in H. R. T. Brandreth, *Ecumenical Ideals*, pp. 78-79.

Arthur C. Benson states, at the conclusion of the chapter on "The Question of Reunion" in his biography of his father, that "the gravity and delicacy of the controversy need no comment; the last word has not been said on the subject."¹⁸ The last word still has not been spoken and one can hope that even the bull on Anglican orders can "be explained." But as Bishop Bell observed, a "chapter was closed, and the next chapter was not to begin until nearly thirty years later, with the help of the same principal collaborations, under the auspices of Cardinal Mercier at Malines."¹⁹ This chapter proved a more promising one and it is very significant in the history of Anglican-Roman Catholic relations.

The Background and Intention of the Conversations at Malines (1921-1926)

For twenty-five years after the issuing of *Apostolicae Curae*, the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches went their separate ways and showed little evidence of a desire for reunion. Abbé Portal, the Lazarist, who for three decades was a great Roman Catholic advocate of an Anglican-Roman Catholic reunion, had abandoned his efforts on orders from the Roman Church, and Lord Halifax had no other alternative but to forget his dream. Lord Halifax was by 1921 eighty-two, and thought and said that his life was over. Nobody believed that he was about to embark on what history will probably call the most astonishing adventure of his long and fruitful life.

J. G. Lockhart has commented that "the Conversations are the most important episode in Halifax's work for Reunion, which was an important—perhaps the most important—work of his life."²⁰ In studying the conversations, it is very important to realize both how they came about and also what their nature was when they did come about.

Lord Halifax and Abbé Protal had become very good friends during the 1890's. During the years following *Apostolicae Curae*, they corresponded with each other, and their desire to further the cause of Anglo-Roman reunion remained paramount. World War I momentarily diverted their attention from ecclesiastical questions, although it was a further proof of the overriding necessity of that reunion which constantly occupied the minds of both men.

The Lambeth Conference in 1920 adopted the Report of the Reunion Committee (under the chairmanship of Archbishop Lang) and sent it out as an *Appeal to All Christian People*. Among the representa-

¹⁸ Arthur C. Benson, *The Life of Edward White Benson* (London, 1899), II, 624.

¹⁹ G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson*, 237.

²⁰ J. G. Lockhart, *loc. cit.*, II, 226.

tives of other Churches to receive the report was Désiré Felicien François Joseph Cardinal Mercier, the Archbishop of Malines since 1906 and the Cardinal Primate of Belgium since 1907.

Cardinal Mercier replied on May 21, 1921, to the report, saying, "May God hearken to the prayers we continually offer for the union of all Christian believers, and crown with success your efforts to attain their goal."²¹ This was the first known correspondence between Archbishop Lang and Cardinal Mercier on the matter of reunion.

The *Appeal* contained the following passage which was very important to Anglican-Roman Catholic relations. The passage states in part:

"If the authorities of other Communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations as having its place in the one family life."²²

Although intended mostly for non-Episcopalians, this statement was fortunately ambiguous enough to be applied to Rome. Here there finally appeared a possible new road, circumventing the apparent dead end which the massive resistance of *Apostolicae Curae* seemed to create. J. G. Lockhart states that

"The possibility of using the Lambeth Appeal in the interests of a new rapprochement seems to have first occurred to Portal, and it was undoubtedly he who suggested to Halifax the approach to Désiré Joseph [Cardinal] Mercier, the venerated Archbishop of Malines."²³

There appear to be several reasons for the suggestion that Cardinal Mercier be approached rather than some other Roman Catholic figure. Anybody who looks at the cardinal's picture gets the feeling of kindness and understanding. He occupied a unique position in the Church, as he was the senior member of the Sacred College of Cardinals. His wartime patriotic leading of the people of Belgium had brought him into contact with a large number of people outside his own Church. The feeling of admiration for him at Princeton, for instance, is so great that he is to be found in the north transept of the Princeton University Chapel enshrined in stained glass. He had given to the Roman Catholic Church an unexcelled example of spiritual leadership in the midst of wrong and oppression. Perhaps the greatness of this man is best expressed by the

²¹ G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson*, 1255.

²² Bettenson, E. (Ed.) *Documents of the Christian Church* (Oxford, 1954), 444.

²³ J. G. Lockhart, *loc. cit.*, II, 267.

great World War I leader, Marshal Foch, who said, "he is the outstanding man of our time."²⁴

The cardinal's letter to the archbishop of Canterbury, acknowledging the *Appeal to all Christian People* and his acquaintance with Abbé Portal, indicated to Lord Halifax and Abbé Portal that his sympathy with the project of reunion would be as certain as the support his stature would bring them.

Lord Halifax was planning a trip to the Continent during the fall of 1921 to visit Abbé Portal, whom he had not seen since 1914. Together they were planning to go visit the battlefields of World War I. After Abbé Portal's suggestion, they enlarged their itinerary to include a journey to Malines, where Portal would arrange for them to have an audience with Cardinal Mercier. On October 7, Lord Halifax wrote Portal that he would try "to have letters from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York for Cardinal Mercier. This visit to the Cardinal seems to me a complete inspiration."²⁵

The letter was written by Archbishop Davidson, who had already a channel of communication with Cardinal Mercier because of the latter's letter of May 21. The archbishop's letter of October 12 was very guarded, and made it quite clear that Halifax was in no sense an ambassador. Lord Halifax had hoped that the archbishops would state in their letter "their own great desire for the healing of the divisions of Christendom and their readiness to promote conferences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome to that end."²⁶ Halifax, needless to say, was disappointed with what he got.

It is difficult to quote out of context from this letter without conveying a totally false impression. It tried to please all parties and must be read *in toto* to do Archbishop Davidson justice. Bishop Bell quotes the most uncordial part of it in his official biography. The letter is very important, however, as it shows the first attitude the archbishop had towards the proposed meeting. I, therefore, am quoting two sentences of it at the risk of misrepresenting the archbishop, by prejudicing the reader :

"Lord Halifax does not go in any sense as an ambassador or formal representative of the Church of England, nor have I endeavored to put before him any suggestions with regard to the possibilities of such conversations as might take place between Your Eminence and himself. Anything he says therefore would be an expression of his personal opinion rather than an authoritative statement of the position or the endeavours of the Church of England in its cor-

²⁴ Donald Drew Ebdert, *Princeton Portraits* (Princeton, 1947), 307.

²⁵ J. G. Lockhart, *loc. cit.*, II, 268.

²⁶ G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson*, 1254.

porate capacity. . . . Lord Halifax's lifelong interest in the whole question must necessarily give weight and importance to the opinion he expresses."

Lord Halifax, however, did carry with him the good wishes of both Archbishop Davidson, who wrote him on October 12, and Archbishop Lang, who wrote him on October 17. The archbishop of Canterbury stated that he appreciated "the motive you have at heart," and that he believed much "may be done by your loving spirit in the use you make of special opportunities, special knowledge, and special personal characteristics which are your own."

On Wednesday, October 19, the cardinal received Lord Halifax and Abbé Portal with the warmest sympathy. However, Cardinal Mercier was a little astonished when Lord Halifax asked him to consider the possibility of conferences between Anglicans and Roman Catholics. He naturally asked Lord Halifax why he did not address himself to the Catholic authorities of his own country. Halifax immediately replied, "L'Etat des esprits s'y oppose." Surprisingly enough, the cardinal understood and told Lord Halifax that if he came to Malines with two dependable theologians he would sponsor the conversations.

Halifax returned to England on October 29 and made a favorable report to the archbishops. Shortly thereafter, he started to look for two trusted and competent theologians. Dr. Frere was an obvious choice. He was an Anglo-Catholic by conviction, was a fine scholar, had a wide reputation in liturgiology, and was a profound sympathizer with the cause of reunion. Dr. Frere was at this time the superior of the Community of the Resurrection, and he became the bishop of Truro after the second conference.

It was a little more difficult to find a colleague. Both Portal and Halifax were agreed on the "inadvisability" of Bishop Charles Gore. On November 24, Halifax wrote to Portal that he was trying to entice Dr. Armitage Robinson, the dean of Wells, to be the second companion. Dean Robinson was a distinguished medievalist and a personal friend of Archbishop Davidson. He was finally persuaded to go by Archbishop Lang after a long silence.

The question of the agenda was as important as that of personnel. The two were closely related, because as Canon Lloyd of Winchester points out, "had the men who met at Malines been other than the particular individuals who took the matter in hand, the talks would have certainly taken a different course and probably dealt with different subjects."²⁷ Halifax drew up a short memorandum in which he stated that

²⁷ Roger Lloyd, *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century*, Vol. II (1919-1939) (London, 1950), 260.

the fundamental point of contention was the nature of the Church. He, however, felt that since the Anglicans and Romans attached very different connotations to the word "Church," it would be better to start by discussing less controversial subjects. This would enable the two parties to discover on what points they agreed rather than on what points they differed. This was a very wise decision of Lord Halifax, as the Roman Catholic Report of the Conversations states, "Negative conclusions could only excite controversies in the press, revive old animosities and create divisions, to the detriment of the cause to which we all are pledged."²⁸ Even wiser was his decision made after the first conference that the doctrinal issues should be dropped, and that, instead, practical methods whereby the Anglican Communion could be brought into communion with the Holy See should be discussed. Both the Archbishop of Canterbury and Cardinal Mercier were surprised with this suggestion, but they finally acquiesced. Canon Lloyd observes:

"The event showed Halifax was wiser than either of them at this juncture. As long as the conversations were held to this point, they achieved something. . . . It was not union! it could never be as long as there was a fundamental cleavage on doctrine. But the Romans showed themselves ready to make and even to suggest real concessions."²⁹

Lord Halifax's memorandum for the first conversation cannot be discussed because of space limitations. But it is important to point out at this moment that Lord Halifax did make the wise decision that got the conversations started on the right foot and enabled them to make some definite contributions to an Anglican-Roman *rapprochement*.

The memorandum was adopted as the basis for the conversation and a copy was sent to the Cardinal. Halifax, Dean Robinson, and Dr. Frere had a preliminary meeting in Halifax's house at 88 Eaton Square, London, and on Monday, December 5, 1921, the three men left for Malines. They were met in the late evening by Canon Dessain, Cardinal Mercier's secretary, at the railroad station. A curious incident, which well represents the spirit of the conversations, happened there. Canon Dessain, "overawed by the ecclesiastical trappings of the Dean of Wells, knelt down and asked for a blessing, which Dr. Armitage Robinson, recovering from his surprise, hastened to give him."³⁰ This spirit of co-operation was to dominate all five meetings.

Bishop Frere illustrates the mood the conversations were held

²⁸ Roman Catholic Report of the Conversations at Malines in *The Conversations at Malines, Official Report*, p. 75.

²⁹ R. Lloyd, *loc. cit.*, II, 267.

³⁰ J. G. Lockhart, *Viscount Halifax*, II, 275.

in by a little story he tells in his book, *Recollections of Malines*:

"I remember going out with Bishop Gore for a short walk before our morning meeting; as we got outside, we found a Rogationtide procession on its way through the parish. So we joined in and followed for some time until it was time to get back to our gathering."

"At déjeuner subsequently, Batiffol [Mrg. Batiffol, a Roman Catholic theologian who attended the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Conversation] said to the Cardinal, 'Eminence, do you know that there were two Anglican Bishops following in the Rogationtide procession this morning?'

"The Cardinal in his grave way said, 'Then indeed we are coming nearer to unity.'

"'Yes,' said Batiffol, 'but does your Eminence know that they didn't follow the procession the whole way?'

"'Oh,' said the Cardinal.

"'No, they left just before the prayer for the Pope!'

"This scandalous misstatement was drowned in roars of laughter; in fact, we had left in the middle of the invocations of the Virgin Martyrs."³¹

The succeeding meetings followed the same organizational pattern as the first meeting. Lord Halifax states in a letter to his son, written on December 7, that they had Mass in the Domestic Chapel at 7:00. At 9:00 there was coffee, and at 10:00 the three Anglicans and Abbé Portal assembled in the large drawing room opposite the Chapel. The Vicar-General of Malines (Monseigneur Van Roy) and the Cardinal then came in. "We exchange a word or so, then sit around a table—the Cardinal, then me, then the Abbé, then the Vicar-General, then Walter Frere, then the Dean of Wells, the other side of the Cardinal opposite of me." The first session continued until 1:00 or 1:30, and there was a second session between 4:00 and 7:00. Dinner was at 7:30, and after dinner the guests were free to attend to their personal business. This schedule shows a great informality and congeniality, and certainly must have provided the best possible atmosphere to hold such discussions in.

Malines and History

It is difficult to tell what the significance of the Malines Conversations for Reunion will eventually be, but there are at least five points about them that must be mentioned in order to reflect on their historical legacy.

In the first place, the Conversations were the first gathering of prominent theologians of the Roman Catholic and of the Anglican

³¹ See W. H. Frere, *Recollections of Malines* (London, 1935).

Churches since the Great Schism of 1534. As both Cardinal Mercier and Dean Robinson pointed out, the very fact that they were being held in such an atmosphere is a very encouraging sign.

Secondly, new channels of thought and methods of study were opened. Fr. Brandreth O.G.S. remarks that "the spirit of Malines has informed many small and informal meetings between members of the Roman and other churches, and has shown itself as a torch whose light has waxed rather than waned."²²

Such meetings and discussions are breaking down the old wall of prejudice that separates the churches, and perhaps by creating an atmosphere of better understanding they will some day lead to a concrete collection of individual efforts in the form of reunion.

The Official Report of the Anglican Delegations provides us with our third point, "The net gain of this series of Conversations may be described as the elimination of several subjects which have ceased to be causes of difference, and the elucidation of others that still remain."²³ The First Conversation discussed several dogmatic questions which had been subjects of contention in the past and which need not be as controversial in the future. The Memoranda on practical methods of corporate unification which were the outcome of the Second Conversations are very significant. The deep-seated doctrinal cleavages that were discussed during the Third and the Fourth Conversation led to less spectacular but nevertheless significant agreements. Perhaps, however, the most significant episode of the entire Conversations was the memorandum by a canonist ("The Church of England United not Absorbed"), which Cardinal Mercier sympathized with! It is perhaps significant that educated people now see reunion as a union of churches and not a submission of one to the other or an absorption of one into the other.

In the fourth place, Malines must be considered in the light of English Church history. Fr. Brandreth says, "In one sense Malines fittingly sums up nearly a century of endeavor to put into practice the ecumenical ideals of the Oxford Movement. The Tractarians and their successors always saw their task primarily in terms of Rome and the East."²⁴ Malines certainly can be seen as the end of the ecumenical road of the Oxford Movement. It did not achieve reunion, but it did achieve a better understanding, and it is impossible to tell where this understanding in the future may lead the two Churches.

²² H. R. T. Brandreth, O.G.S., "Approaches of the Churches Towards Each Other in the Nineteenth Century" in *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948*, edited by Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill, 299.

²³ *Official Report of the Conversations at Malines* (London, 1928), 44.

²⁴ H. R. T. Brandreth, *loc. cit.*, 299.

The fifth significant factor of Malines ties together the two events mentioned in this article. It is remarkable that only twenty-five years after the conclusion of the heated controversy over Anglican orders a gathering in such a friendly spirit would be possible. This in itself shows an ecumenical zeal that we cannot but admire.

However, there appear to be four lessons that we must draw from the Conversations in order realistically to face the future. In the first place, there are great doctrinal gulfs that Malines made apparent, and which there seems little hope of bridging. Before Malines, it might have been thought that the question of Anglican orders was the biggest of these gulfs, but Malines has made it apparent that the greatest gulf that must be bridged is the question of the supremacy of the Pope. All other questions seemed to be comprehended in this problem, and Malines offered little hope for the construction of a bridge over this great gulf in the near future.

Secondly, there seems to be a clear conviction on the part of both Churches that these Conversations must not be repeated. The public reaction in both the Anglican and the Roman Catholic world at the time of the Conversations clearly showed that the laity of both Churches were not in the mood for such discussions, and the Conversations, therefore, had little popular support. In order to achieve reunion, it is necessary to achieve popular sympathy for it by breaking down the old walls of prejudice, and the members of neither Church were at that time ready for reunion. The Conversations acted like a sort of public vaccination on this subject. The public reaction was at first rather violent, but the net effect of this vaccination seems to have been to give some immunity to the disease of prejudice which has surrounded the members of the two Churches. The Anglican Report concluded that the participants in the Conversations :

"express the earnest hope that similar conferences may be continued in the future, in order that the work begun with Cardinal Mercier's blessing and under his auspices may be still further carried on, and by God's blessing and in God's time fulfill words so constantly on the Cardinal's lips, '*Ut unum sint.*'"³⁵

Nobody knows when God's time will be, but at present it is not possible to see it in the near future.

In the third place, both the controversy over Anglican orders and the manner in which the Conversations were brought to a close indicate that one of the chief obstacles to be overcome is the opposition of the English Roman Catholics. In both incidents, their "intrigues" seemed

³⁵ *Official Report*, 46.

decisive, and it is hard to see how anything can come in the way of better understanding or reunion of any sort until their attitude changes.

Lastly, it is impossible to see how reunion between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Church is ever going to be achieved. Leo XIII was a thorough gentleman, which is not always the case among popes. Cardinal Ratti (Pope Pius XI) was reported to take a deep interest in reunion. World War I had swept Europe with a wave of disillusionment that gave both Churches a feeling of the need to consolidate their ranks. As I have already pointed out, few people in the history of Christianity have had as much of a passion for reunion as Abbé Portal, Lord Halifax, and Cardinal Mercier. If Malines failed, what will it take to succeed?

The answer is that it is unlikely that a reunion movement of any sort will succeed to unite the Anglican and the Roman Catholic Churches under the present or foreseeable circumstances. Under the most favorable conditions that one is likely to find for a century, the Conversations were unable to reunite the Churches. However, perhaps this is too much to expect for them. Indeed, when we look back at these gatherings today, the surprising thing is how much agreement the participants found among themselves, and not how little they achieved.

Before concluding this brief examination of the relation between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches during the three decades, 1896-1926, it is only appropriate to mention Lord Halifax's contribution. It would be trite to attempt to eulogize this great man, and it has been done by people far more erudite on the subject than I am. When he died on January 19, 1934, six years to the day after he had published the Report on the Conversations at Malines, the Anglican Church lost one of the greatest of her servants. He was an International Churchman, and a prophet of and worker for reunion, such as the Church had never before found. He seemed to have a lay vocation to bring about a united Christendom. His work may not have achieved tangible results, but it has laid a large cornerstone upon which the edifice of union may yet with God's blessing be built. J. G. Lockhart sums up his work very well:

"If the Conversations failed in their immediate objective, they failed magnificently and, for Halifax, heroically. His faith had been proof against every discouragement and rebuff, the sheer difficulty of the attempt, the lukewarmness of those he believed should be the friends and the manoeuvres of those he knew to be the enemies of his cause. During the seven years of his struggle, the vision of Reunion was seldom out of his thoughts and never out of his prayers, inspiring him, transporting him, and so enabling him to inspire and

transport others; and to that vision he dedicated all the powers of mind and body that remained to him."³⁶

Lord Halifax left behind him one solid token of his work, and in order to end on an optimistic note it is a good idea to tell the story of it. On Wednesday, January 20, Lord Halifax, despite his eighty-four years, crossed the Channel for Malines, in response to a message he had received the previous day that the Cardinal would like to see him. Thursday morning, he and Abbé Portal attended Mass, said by Canon Dessain at 7:00 A.M., in the dying Cardinal's bedroom. After Mass, the Cardinal:

"opened wide his bony arms, and drew his English friend to his heart. For a long while Mercier rested his tired head on the other's shoulder. Then he slipped his pastoral ring off his finger.

"You see this ring," he whispered. "It is engraved with the names of St. Désiré and St. Joseph, my patron Saints, and St. Rombaut, the patron saint of our cathedral. It was given to me by my family when I was appointed a bishop. Well, if I am to die, I ask you to accept it as a gift."³⁷

Lord Halifax made a gesture of protest, but Abbé Portal said, "Yes, yes for you and Edward." Lord Halifax wore the ring on a chain around his neck until he died. Then it was welded into a chalice just above the base, and the present Lord Halifax gave it to York Minster. Every year on St. Peter's Day (June 29), on the anniversary of the death of Cardinal Mercier (January 23) and on the anniversary of the death of Lord Halifax (January 19), this chalice is used. Let us hope that this one solid outcome of the Conversations will be a portent *ut unum sint ad majorem Dei gloriam.*

II.

The Relations Between the Anglican and Old Catholic Churches

THE Old Catholic Church is the one Church within the Catholic world which has established intercommunion with the Anglican Church. Although the Old Catholics are the spiritual descendants of the Jansenists, they did not break with the Roman Catholic Church until 1871. In that year, leading members of a group of priests and laymen in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland met in a congress at Munich. These priests and laymen had refused to submit to the dogma of Papal Infallibility.

³⁶ J. G. Lockhart, *loc. cit.*, 374.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 342.

bility, and the purpose of the congress was to provide for their spiritual needs.

The necessary hierarchy was provided by the Church of Utrecht. This Church had been isolated from Rome since the Jansenist Controversy of the eighteenth century, when a leading Jansenist, Pasquier Quesnal, published a book entitled *Moral Reflections on the New Testament*, which was condemned by the Bull *Unigenitius* in 1713. This led to the formation of the Jansenist Church of Utrecht in 1723. This Church, and more particularly Archbishop Loos of Utrecht (1858-1873), showed a sympathy with the movement from the very start.

However, Archbishop Loos, when he attended the second Old Catholic Congress at Cologne in 1872, advised this group of discontented priests and laymen not to break away from Rome. Nevertheless, in 1873 Archbishop Loos promised to consecrate a bishop for the German Old Catholics. He died before he could fulfill his promise, but Bishop Heykamp of Deventer (who became Archbishop of Utrecht in 1875) consecrated Gaspard Johannes Rinkel as Bishop of Haarlem (1873-1906) and Josef Hubert Reikens as Bishop of the Old Catholic Church in Germany (1873-1896) on August 11, 1873.

From the very beginning, the reunion of all Christians on the basis of the ancient faith of the Church has been the concern of the Old Catholics. At the Congress at Munich in 1871, the directive which has influenced Old Catholic ecumenical activity ever since was formulated. In part it stated:

"We hope for reunion with the Greek-Oriental and Russian Churches, the separation of which was not brought about by any decisive courses and which is not based on any irreconcilable doctrinal difference. We hope for a gradual *rapprochement* with the Protestant and with the Episcopal Churches."¹

Anglican divines from the very beginning have also showed sympathy with the Old Catholic Church. In a letter written on February 26, 1888, to the Rev. G. F. Hooper, Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury said:

"The Old Catholics have a far stronger reason for breaking away from Rome than we had. They see the outcome and development of the Papal pretensions, of which our fathers only saw the first stages."²

¹ H. R. T. Brandreth, "Approaches of the Churches Towards Each Other in the Nineteenth Century" (Section 4—Towards the Union of the Churches) in Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill (ed.) *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948* (London, 1954), 292.

² The Bishop of Salisbury to the Rev. G. F. Hooper, February 26, 1888 as quoted in E. W. Watson, *Life of John Wordsworth* (London, 1915), 320.

Bishop John Wordsworth's father, Bishop Christopher Wordsworth of Lincoln, and Bishop Brown of Ely sent letters of greeting to the first Old Catholic Congress (Munich, 1871). However, the first real exchange of views and opinions between leaders of the two Churches occurred in 1874, when theologians of the Old Catholic, Orthodox, Anglican, and Danish Churches met at Bonn. Remarkable agreements were achieved, and at the second conference in 1875 some agreement was even reached with the Orthodox about the Filioque clause.

The Church of Utrecht was unrepresented at the Bonn Conferences, and it maintained an attitude of aloofness until the beginning of the twentieth century. As late as 1904, Bishop Van Theil of Haarlem referred to the giving of communion in the Old Catholic Church to Bishop Brent as "the kind of thing [that] should not occur again."³

Throughout this period, the great historian, Ignaz von Döllinger (1799-1890), was the most notable theologian of the new movement. In his famous lectures, given in March 1872, on *The Reunion of the Churches*, he spoke of the possibility of a reunited Christendom. He concluded by saying:

"What can, what ought to be done! . . . The right instruments would be found in men, both of the clergy and laity, who would unite for common action, first in Germany, untrammelled by instructions, and simply following their own mind and judgment. They would soon draw others to them in rapidly increasing numbers. . . . Thus would an international society of the noblest and most beneficial kind be formed, and what began as a snowball might well become an irresistible avalanche."⁴

It was probably Döllinger's passion for reunion and the Old Catholics' somewhat small numbers and isolated position that led to their interest in ecumenical activity.

C. B. Moss, in his book *The Old Catholic Movement*, says that there are five periods in the history of the relations between the Anglican and Old Catholic Churches. The first of these periods is the period of John Mason Neale. Dr. Neale wrote a definitive book on the Church of Utrecht, entitled *The History of the So-Called Jansenist Church of Utrecht*. The book is not only based on historical research but also on visits to Utrecht. He concludes the book on a note of understanding:

"The steadfast piety that has distinguished this communion for a century and a half [has] sent up so many earnest prayers to the Supreme Judge to vindicate its innocence, and make known the righteousness of its cause."⁵

³ H. R. T. Brandreth, *loc. cit.*, 293.

⁴ Ignaz von Döllinger, *The Reunion of the Churches* (London, 1872), 662.

⁵ J. M. Neale, *loc. cit.*, 380.

The second and third periods are exemplified by Bishop Christopher Wordsworth of Lincoln and his son, Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury, respectively. The second period began with the passage by the Convocation of Canterbury on June 16, 1871, of a motion made by Bishop Christopher Wordsworth. This motion was a formal repudiation of the Vatican Council and a message of sympathy for Archbishop Loos of Utrecht.

There are many events that occurred during this period. Numerous visits were made between the leaders of the two Churches. Two events had special significance. In 1879, the Synod of the Swiss Old Catholic Church and, in 1883, the Synod of the German Old Catholic Church enacted canons permitting members of the Anglican Communion to communicate at their altars. The second event was the first known case of the admission of an Anglican to communion at an Old Catholic altar in 1875. Strangely enough, this occurred in Holland, where, as we have observed, the Old Catholics were rather aloof to the Anglican Church. The Anglican was Fr. F. W. Puller, who was passing through Utrecht on his way to the Bonn Conference and was given communion by the dean of Utrecht.

There are two characteristics of this second period: (1) it was a period of the formation of Old Catholic institutions; (2) it was a period when the Anglican Church was not yet ready for reunion. The Catholic revival in the Church of England had not yet made sufficient progress to overcome the barriers previous centuries had erected, and the correlation between the Church of England and the nation was still too widespread for reunion with a foreign church to be understood.

Bishop Christopher Wordsworth died on March 21, 1885, and his son was to succeed him as the outstanding figure in Anglican-Old Catholic relations during the next two decades. The great event of the third period was the informal and provisional sanction given to intercommunion with the "Swiss Christian Catholic Church" and the Old Catholic Church in Germany by the Lambeth Conference of 1888. These resolutions embodied Bishop Wordsworth's report, and were the first semi-formal sanction given to intercommunion from the Anglican side. It must not be forgotten that not only had the Swiss and German Old Catholic Churches sanctioned intercommunion nine and five years earlier, respectively, but that their sanction was of a more formal kind. The Lambeth Conference is not a convocation or a synod, and its resolutions bind no one in the legal sense.

The part of the resolution concerning the Swiss and German Old Catholic Churches read:

"That we regard it as a duty to promote friendly relations with the Old Catholic Community in Germany, and with the 'Christian Catholic Church in Switzerland,' not only of sympathy with them, but also in thankfulness to God, Who has strengthened them to suffer for the truth under great discouragement, difficulties, and temptations; and that we offer them the privileges recommended by the Committee under the conditions specified in its Report."⁶

It is interesting to note what the conditions specified in the report were. There was to be intercommunion among all Anglicans and Old Catholics, except two types. The first of these types are Old Catholics that have "contracted a marriage not sanctioned by the laws and canons of the Anglican Church." A good example of this is that the Anglican Church prohibits marriage with a deceased wife's sister, while the Old Catholic Church permits it. The reason for this was that the Old Catholics followed the Lutheran and Roman Catholic example and permitted marriage within certain degrees prohibited by the Anglican Church. Secondly, "in justice to the Old Catholics, anyone who would be debarred from Communion among themselves" will not be admitted to communion in the Anglican Church.

The Dutch Old Catholics were not included in this agreement, for the Church of Utrecht still maintained aloofness. There were two points of controversy that kept the two Churches apart. The first of these was that until 1889 the Church of Utrecht adhered to the dogmas of Trent. This cause of difference was removed by the Declaration of Utrecht, which was published in that year. The second point of controversy was the old question of Anglican orders. They would not, as C. B. Moss points out, "assent to anything of the truth of which they were not sure. . . . Their firmness made their acceptance all the more valuable when it was finally given."⁷

Bishop Wordsworth wrote two letters in Latin, entitled *Epistolae ad Batavos*, in order to convince the Dutch Old Catholics of the validity of Anglican orders. Archbishop Gul of Utrecht (1892-1920) appointed a commission to consider the question, but the report of this commission was indecisive because of its inability to determine the doctrinal issue. There was little progress made from then until 1908.

The fourth period of relations between the two Churches started in 1908, when the Rev. George E. Barber founded the Society of St. Willibrord in an attempt to bring about closer relations between the two Churches. Bishop Collins of Gibraltar and Bishop Prins of Haarlem were

⁶ Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1888, as quoted in C. B. Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement: Its Origins and History* (London, 1948), 335.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 336.

the first presidents. Many Anglican dignitaries, such as Bishop Gore, joined it, and the Society continued its work until the outbreak of World War I in 1914.

An unusual and virtuous person greatly hampered the work of the Society. He was Bishop Mathew, who is described by Bishop Bell as being "one of the most curious figures whom the Archbishop met in the ecclesiastical sphere."⁸ Unfortunately, I do not have time to recapitulate the fascinating story of his career. He was consecrated a bishop of the Old Catholic Church on April 28, 1908, and was supposed to administer to the Old Catholics in England. There were, as it turned out, so few Old Catholics in England that there was no need for a bishop. On December 29, 1910, after the inexcusable consecration of two Roman Catholic priests as bishops, Bishop Mathew issued a "Declaration of Autonomy and Independence." Bishop Mathew proceeded to consecrate ten more bishops after his severance with the Church of Utrecht. Archbishop Davidson in a letter to the Bishop of London said that Bishop Mathew had:

"played fast and loose with great questions of Church Order, and thus set going, in different ways and in different lands, schisms which it may take many years to heal. He has given to ecclesiastical adventures, less honest than himself, an example fraught with abundant peril."⁹

The fifth period of relations between the two Churches started after World War I. It was a period of great progress which was consummated on June 2, 1925, by the recognition of Anglican orders by the Church of Utrecht, and in 1932 by the establishment of intercommunion. The decision regarding Anglican orders was formally approved by the Old Catholic Church in Germany and in Switzerland the same year, although in fact, if not in theory, they had recognized Anglican orders since their canons of intercommunion in the nineteenth century.

At the World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne in 1927, the delegations of both the Old Catholic and the Orthodox Churches were approached with the idea of sending representatives to Lambeth in 1930. The Old Catholics seemed enthusiastic and showed a desire to discuss intercommunion. In July 1931, a conference was held at Bonn which discussed both this issue and the idea of interconsecration. The two parties at the conference came to an agreement consisting of three points which was subsequently ratified by the synods of the Old Catholic

⁸ G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1952), 1016.

⁹ The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of London, September 12, 1917, as printed in G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p. 1022.

Churches and by the convocations of Canterbury and York. The three points of the agreement were:

1. "Each Communion recognizes the catholicity and independence of the other and maintains its own.
2. "Each Communion agrees to admit members of the other Communion to participate in the Sacraments.
3. "Inter-Communion does not require from either Communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotions, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other but implies that each believes the other to hold the essentials of the Christian Faith."¹⁰

The agreement also carried the necessary authority for interconsecration. This had two practical consequences. It not only helped dispel some of the doubts of Orthodox theologians about Anglican orders, but it has also begun to merge the succession of the Old Catholic Church with that of the Anglican Communion. Since the Roman Catholic Church recognizes the validity of the orders of the Old Catholic Church, this double succession could have great consequences, for it opens a channel through which one of the great existing barriers between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches could be removed.

The establishment of intercommunion between the Anglican and the Old Catholic Church is:

"the one example in the West of intercommunion between a Church that passed through the crisis of the Reformation in the 16th century and another which, though in a sense it has had its own reformation, but escaped the perturbations of that difficult time."¹¹

It is also for the Church of England the first time since the Reformation that she had entered into a full and formal relationship with a Continental Church.

C. B. Moss points out that the Agreement of Bonn has a significance that extends beyond the specific intercommunion that it established. He states in concluding his book on *The Old Catholic Movement*:

"Thus the Agreement of Bonn is a model for the wider reunion of the future. It is not directed against any other Church; but it presents a method by which other churches may hereafter be united,

¹⁰ G. K. A. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, Third Series (1930-1948) (London, 1948), Document 167, p. 60. See following pages for:

A. Letter from the Archbishop of Utrecht to the Archbishop of Canterbury, September 1931.
 B. Convocation of Canterbury, Resolutions of Both Houses, January 20 and 22, 1932.

¹¹ S. C. Neill, "Plans for Union and Reunion, 1910-1948" in R. Rouse and S. C. Neill, *loc. cit.*, 471.

on the three principles of Dogmatic Unity, Mutual Recognition, and Independent Co-operation, and a story of two communions, very different in their history and their outward circumstances, which have learned to love one another, and through love 'to speak the same thing, and to be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment.' "¹²

It is difficult to follow the example the Old Catholic and Anglican Churches have established, but whether or not this type of intercommunion is repeated, the Agreement of Bonn will always serve as a precedent of a successful attempt to recover partially the lost unity of the Catholic Church.

¹² C. B. Moss, *loc. cit.*, 350.

The Philippine Independent Church

(Iglesia Filipina Independiente)

By Norman S. Binsted*

Introductory

NODERN research tends to confirm the assumption of such Filipino historians as Jose Rizal, Trinidad Pardo de Tavera, Epifano de los Santos, and Pedro Maria Paterno, that the many islands which constitute the Philippine archipelago were inhabited by a people who, when the Spanish galleons appeared on the horizon, had long since emerged from barbarism. Although Tavera claimed that without hindrance from Spain, the Philippines would have equalled, if not surpassed, the progress of modern Japan, it must be conceded that the Filipino people owe a lasting debt of gratitude to Spain for the Christianization of the islands and the resultant cultural development of the people. As Dr. Rizal in his *Commentaries to Morga* claims, the islands were conquered not so much by the weapons of the Spanish navy and army as by the cross in the hands of the friars. Certainly the Spanish friars, along with the civil administrators, in spite of their many abuses of authority, kept before the Filipino people the high and uplifting precepts of state and Church. Joseph Ralston Hayden in his book *The Philippines* says,

"The revolts of the Filipinos against Spain, and even against America, were evidence that although Spain had not granted liberty to the Philippines, she unwittingly had taught it there. Aguinaldo, Mabini, Bonifacio, and other revolutionary heroes were fighting for the political heritage of the West."

To Spain must go the credit for bringing to the threshold of nationhood a people of forty-three ethnographic groups, speaking eighty-seven languages and dialects, and inhabiting more than 2,700 islands. This was acknowledged by President Quezon in a public address in 1936, in which he said,

"But above all, we owe to Spain the preservation for the benefit of our own people of the soil of our country, as well as laying down, by

* The Right Rev. Norman S. Binsted, D.D., was consecrated first Bishop of Tohoku (Japan), December 3, 1928. In 1940, he was transferred to the Philippine Islands, and in 1942 was elected third Missionary Bishop of the Philippines. He retired in 1957. Bishop Binsted had a crucial part in the bestowal of the Apostolic Succession to the Philippine Independent Church. This paper was prepared by him from information supplied by Mons. Isabelo de los Reyes, Jr., Obispo Maximo, Iglesia Filipina Independiente, and from other sources.—Editor's note.

means of religion and education, of the foundations of our national unity. It is thus that the archipelago, composed of numerous isolated islands, which in 1521 was discovered by Magellan, and was but a geographical expression apparently without any common interest or aspiration, is today a compact and solid nation, with its own history, its heroes, its martyrs, and its own flag, a people uplifted by a consciousness of its own personality, feeling a deep sense of worth and inspired by a high vision of its great destiny."¹

The Spanish friars, through the faith which they inculcated, created a sense of personal worth and a love of liberty, which resulted in the Filipinos becoming the foremost advocates in Asia of liberty, truth, and progress. The Philippine Revolution of 1896, which sparked a chain explosion of formidable national movements in Asia for independence, was inherent in the faith they had accepted from their Spanish teachers.

Unfortunately, the Roman Catholic Church for more than three centuries grasped and exercised such a measure of political power that it was inevitably identified with the state and thereby came under the condemnation of the Filipinos, not only for its own peculiar ecclesiastical shortcomings, but also for the political sins of the state. There was complete confusion in the minds of the people as to the functions of the Church and those of the state. This was particularly true in their relations with the powerful religious orders. The Church, in accepting political privileges and responsibility, was blamed along with the state for the political oppression and exploitation of the people.

It followed, therefore, that rebellion against the state involved rebellion against the Church. And the Revolution of 1896, motivated by an overwhelming urge for political freedom, afforded the Filipinos an opportunity, and placed upon them the necessity, of fighting for religious liberty. Both Church and state were stigmatized as the enemies of the people. Among the Filipino patriots, who fought not only for political freedom, but led the fight for religious liberty, were Rizal, Mabini, Reginor, Bonifacio, M. H. Pilar, Isabelo de los Reyes, and Aglipay. "Looking back, it appears inevitable that the leaders in their fight for freedom from Spain should have planned for a national free Church."²

Rome's Failure to Recognize National Aspirations

The Roman Catholic Church in the Philippines, founded by men of integrity and apostolic zeal, became, under their more worldly successors, the victim of its own success, with its resultant wealth and prestige. Due to its affiliation with the state, it maneuvered itself into a position where

¹ *Messages of the President*, Vol. 2, Part 1, p. 26.

² Louis C. Cornish, *The Philippines Calling*.

it was unwilling, or unable, to turn to its own advantage the national aspirations of the Filipino people. It had, in union with the state, built its authority on the suppression rather than the development of the people. In its execution in 1872 of three Filipino priests—Burgos, Zamora, and Gomez—allegedly for complicity in the Cavite military uprising, but in reality for demanding recognition of rights for the Filipino clergy and for exposing the abuses of the friars, the Church fanned the flames of rebellion. While the martyrdom of these three priests shocked and for a brief period silenced the Filipino patriots, it kindled the imagination of Jose Rizal, and added impetus to the national movement for political and ecclesiastical autonomy. Years of patient endurance of indignities preceded open revolt. This is substantiated by the fact that a commission of three laymen resident in Spain—Isabelo de los Reyes, Severino de los Alas, and Manuel de Leon—petitioned the pope for reforms which would insure recognition of the rights of the national clergy.

The commission sought the assistance of the papal nuncio to the court of Spain, Cardinal Nava di Bontife, in presenting a petition to the pope, designed to secure for the Filipino clergy the same rights as those enjoyed by the Spanish friars, particularly that worthy Filipino priests be elevated to the episcopate. If the petition were favorably acted upon by the pope, the commission pledged in the name of General Aguinaldo the release of the Spanish bishops, friars, and nuns imprisoned at the outbreak of the revolution. The pope, under pressure from the Spanish hierarchy in Manila, declined to consider the petition and declared himself opposed to the elevation of Filipinos to the episcopate, which decision he affirmed to be irrevocable, even should Aguinaldo in consequence execute all Spanish prisoners of war. This arrogant reply terminated all further negotiations with the Vatican.

The pope's intransigent attitude resulted in the defection to the revolutionary forces of Father Gregorio Aglipay, the outstanding leader among the Filipino priests. He was received with open arms by General Aguinaldo and appointed chaplain general of the revolutionary forces. This appointment on October 20, 1898, was highly significant. As "Victorio General Castrense," he became the chief religious leader of the people in arms. Immediately upon his acceptance of the appointment, he was excommunicated and declared a schismatic by the archbishop of Manila. However, unintimidated, Father Aglipay in turn excommunicated Archbishop Nozaleda, and from his headquarters in Tarlac issued a manifesto on August 19, 1899, declaring Nozaleda without authority in the country, and asserted the right of an independent people to nominate their own ecclesiastical chief.

Filipino Priests Organize

Impelled by the chaotic state of the Church as a result of the revolution, Father Aglipay issued a call to the Filipino priests to meet at Paniqui, Tarlac, on October 23, 1899, to effect an organization competent to deal with the existing emergency and to proffer their continued allegiance to the pope, provided he gave consideration to their demands. About twenty-four priests, representing all the dioceses in Luzon, responded to the call, and, under the dynamic leadership of Aglipay, organized a National Council of Filipino Clergy, and adopted a "Provisional Constitution," to be in force until such time as the pope concurred in their demands for reforms.

The "Provisional Constitution" makes it clear that at this time there was no intention in the minds of its framers to create an heretical or schismatic body. Their announced purpose was to provide for the spiritual needs of the people in the emergency, and to make it possible for them to discharge their priestly duties, while awaiting favorable action by the Vatican.

The "Provisional Constitution" provided for a council composed of two elected delegates from each diocese, presided over by a president elected by the delegates, and a secretary, appointed by the president. The council assumed authority to administer the Filipino Catholic Church until peace was established with Rome. This covered control of Church finances; the appointment and transfer of ecclesiastical governors and vicars; the maintenance of proper relations with the civil government; the nomination of priests to the pope for appointment as bishops; to adjudicate cases appealed from the ecclesiastical governors; and the appointment of a commission to negotiate with the Vatican for reforms. The president of the council was pledged to exercise authority in accordance with the provisions of the "Provisional Constitution," and, in so far as it could do so in abnormal times, in accordance with the canon law of the Roman Catholic Church.

The council claimed no right to create bishops. At this time, neither Father Aglipay nor any priest associated with him assumed episcopal prerogatives, although necessity forced upon them administrative functions usually exercised by diocesans.

Juan A. Rivera, in his thesis on *The Aglipayan Movement*, says:

"To all intents and purposes, a national Filipino Church was established at Paniqui. Independence from the control of the Spanish prelates was declared in no ambiguous terms. The Church machinery was definitely established and organized. Powers to negotiate directly with Rome were boldly assumed. To be sure, the constitution

was declared to be temporary in character, but the condition that it should cease to operate when agreement with Rome be reached, should in no way disrupt the newly established hierarchy. It was apparent that the Filipino priests intended, if it was within their power to do so, to perpetuate this organization."

The collapse of the revolutionary government all but extinguished the hope of the Council of Filipino Priests. However, their heroic determination did survive that catastrophe, and they continued to look to Rome for redress from the wrongs which they had suffered under the Spanish priests. They waited patiently before coming to a final break with the Vatican.

Secession from Rome and the Birth of the "Iglesia Filipina Independiente"

The fall of the revolutionary government, with which the Filipino clergy had made common cause, plunged into despair those who had so valiantly contended with Rome for the recognition of their natural aspirations. But the arrival in Manila Bay of the United States naval forces under Admiral Dewey heralded a new day and revived their hopes. That historic event marked the death of Spanish sovereignty in the Philippines and the liberation of the forces of freedom so inextricably intermixed with the Gospel preached by the friars, but so stubbornly suppressed by them for their own selfish ends.

There is an interesting parallel between the first disciples of Jesus and those who struck for ecclesiastical independence in the Philippines. In both instances, they were drawn for the most part from the working classes, rather than from the entrenched privileged classes.

The Iglesia Filipina Independiente came to birth in a labor convention. It was proclaimed by a distinguished layman, Isabelo de los Reyes, one of the three delegates who had sought in vain the help of the papal nuncio to the court of Madrid. Still smarting under the papal rebuff to the commission's petition, de los Reyes returned to his homeland and bided his time until he could persuade the Filipino clergy and laity to sever their connections with the Vatican.

On August 3, 1902, he seized an opportunity which came to him as president of La Union Obrera Democratica. In an address to a convention of the union, meeting in Centre de Bellas Artes Building in Manila, attended by approximately two thousand printers, lithographers, cigar makers and artisans, asserting that without religious freedom no freedom was secure, he advocated immediate secession from Rome and the organization of an independent democratic Church. Informing his

audience that a popular meeting protesting against the return of alien bishops and priests to dioceses and parishes, called for the previous day by Pascual H. Polete, had been cancelled for lack of a police permit, de los Reyes declared:

"I am fed up with the arrogant attitude of the Vatican towards all demands from our people for justice towards the Filipino clergy, and with the full approval of the Governing Board and on behalf of 'La Union Obrera Democratica,' I assure Mr. Pascual H. Polete of our full cooperation in his campaign against the appointment of alien bishops and the return of Spanish friars to our parishes. I solemnly and without any reservations declare that today we definitely secede from the Church of Rome and renounce allegiance to the Vatican, and, relying on God's aid, proclaim ourselves members of a Christian, Catholic, Independent Church, to be ruled and administered by Filipinos. . . . We shall obey the holy commandments of God, but shall never tolerate the injustices and capricious fancies of men. We shall continue our devotions to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, but our adoration shall ever be given to God alone and not to any of His creatures. . . . As is done in the United States, we will choose our own bishops through the expressed will of the people here assembled and we will recognize them and submit to their authority. If the Roman Pope abides by this sovereign action of the people and accepts our bishops, as has happened in other countries in times past, his approval will be the best refutation to our charge that, influenced by the poisonous machinations of the friars, he hates the Filipino clergy, and we will hasten to rectify our error and beg his forgiveness. However, if he persists in his opposition, as is most probable, then, gentlemen, we will carry on and will affirm that we stand in no need of the consent and approval of our actions by the avowed enemy of the Filipino clergy."

This stirring call to immediate and direct action by de los Reyes received a delirious ovation, according to the account printed later in the *Iglesia Filipina Independiente Revista Catolica*. Without waiting to call a special assembly of clergy and laity, those present proclaimed the establishment of the "Iglesia Catolica Apostolica Filipina Independiente," and proceeded at once to elect Filipino priests to newly named dioceses.

Seventeen diocesan bishops were elected, and the Rev. Gregorio Aglipay was elected Obispo Maximo. These men constituted the "Venerable Supreme Council of Bishops." To assist them in the administration of the Church, an executive committee of laymen, composed of a number of prominent Filipinos, was appointed under the presidency of Isabelo de los Reyes and with Simon Mandac as secretary. The incumbent United States Governor-General, William Howard Taft, was elected honorary president of the Church.

Such bold and precipitate action, as was to be expected, produced

strong and immediate repercussions. The next day, when the public was apprised of the sensational transactions of the convention, through electrifying headlines in the press, about nine-tenths of the laymen elected to the executive committee declined to serve and withheld allegiance to the newly organized Church. Among those who accepted were General Aguinaldo, Jose Palma (author of the National Anthem), Don Felipe Buencamino, and a few others.

Gregorio Aglipay, startled by the sudden turn of events, disclaimed in an open letter to the Filipino clergy any connection with de los Reyes, and urged caution in joining the movement. He, himself, withdrew to the convent of the Spanish Jesuits for spiritual retreat and to determine his own course of action. He left no record of his conversations with the Jesuit Fathers, but it is apparent that they convinced him of the futility of pressing upon the pope a demand for the appointment of Filipino priests to the episcopate, for, while with them, he resolved his dilemma by a decision to accept his election as Obispo Maximo of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, convinced that in this way he could best serve God and country. Leaving the house of the Jesuits, he presented himself to de los Reyes and announced his willingness to accept the election.

The Church Faces Its Task

Isabelo de los Reyes, Gregorio Aglipay, and their associate reformers, were determined to Filipinize the whole body of the Church established and ruled by the friars. Certainly, in the early days of the movement, the organization of a new sectarian body, without organic connection with the ancient Church of Rome, was not even considered as an alternative. The leaders contemplated the unanimous backing of the Filipino clergy and laity, and fully expected the Iglesia Filipina Independiente to supplant the Roman Church in the islands and to fall heir to its wealth and property. Their ideal was a national Church: Catholic and apostolic in doctrine, discipline, and worship, but emancipated from Spanish domination. This is the tenor of the early official documents of the Church, such as the Paniqui "Provisional Constitution" of 1899 and the later "Provisional Constitution" of 1902, and even of the 1903 "Doctrine and Constitutional Rules," together with the "Six Fundamental Epistles." The hope of ultimate reconciliation with the pope with their independent status as a national Church safeguarded, was only belatedly and reluctantly abandoned.

Had the Revolution of 1896 succeeded, there is reason to think that their hopes might have been realized. But with the defeat of Aguinaldo and the seizure of the Islands from Spain by the United States,

while it resulted in the curtailment of the friars' powers and the disbursement of much of their wealth, it also insured to the Roman Church the protection of a stable government. The directive issued by President William McKinley to the second Philippine Commission that "the separation between State and Church shall be real, entire and absolute," to a Church as wise and experienced as Rome in political and ecclesiastical affairs, could be made to work to her advantage, even though its substance was distasteful to her. By ridding her of the discredited Spanish friars, most of whom fled the country with the advent of the Americans, and clearing the field for reforms, the President's firm directive perhaps saved the day for the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippines. Fresh armies of missionary priests, sympathetic with democratic ideals and national aspirations, were rushed in from Belgium, Holland, Ireland, England, Italy, and America, who at once set about to train and prepare Filipino priests for positions of leadership and responsibility. Thus immediate steps were taken to effect the long overdue reforms for which de los Reyes and Aglipay had contended in vain. The astute and speedy move by the Vatican reassured many of the laity, and restrained them from joining the movement for a national Church.

Nevertheless, the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, by this time, had gained such momentum that it could not be stopped. Whole populations of hundreds of towns joined the movement, and in Ilocos Norte the whole body of Filipino clergy, except one, gave allegiance to the national Church. Under the magnetic appeal of its early leaders, more than three million joined the infant Church, about two-thirds of whom were to remain fanatically loyal during the days of privation and persecution which followed.

The task confronting the newly appointed Obispo Maximo and his Church was enormous. Within a matter of weeks, more than three million souls were looking to it for spiritual care, and daily other thousands were demanding admission to its fold. It was entirely unprepared for its task. The times were urgent and everything had to be done on a provisional basis. The Church, although resolved to be Catholic and apostolic in doctrine, discipline, and worship, lacked the Catholic ministry, save for the validly ordained priests, and was without diocesan or a strong central organization. Few of the Filipino priests had had administrative responsibility above the parochial level, and their numerical strength was entirely inadequate to the pastoral demands made upon them. Where parochial congregations joined the movement in a body, the use of parish churches was continued. This, however, was a tentative arrangement, subject to final adjudication in the civil courts. Added to the tremendous

administrative and pastoral problems were the difficulties of travel. Many parishes could only be reached by foot or horseback, which sometimes required weeks of arduous travel. Considering the difficulties, external and internal, confronting the Iglesia Filipina Independiente in the years immediately following its break with Rome, its survival seems miraculous. Too much credit cannot be given Mons. Gregorio Aglipay for his accomplishment in welding into a strong organization the great mass of men and women suddenly committed to his spiritual care. It was inevitable that the impress made by his dynamic personality upon the Iglesia Filipina Independiente should continue for many years.

Because the times were urgent and the Church had to function without delay, it did as other bodies separating from Rome had done in the early days of secession. It renounced allegiance to the pope, but retained the same ministry, at least in name, the same dogma, creeds, and canon law to which the priests and the people had been accustomed in the Roman Church. Under a hastily devised Provisional Constitution, provision was made for the election of an *Obispo Maximo*, whose powers in spiritual matters were absolute, while in the administration of the temporalities of the Church, he was assisted by a "Supreme Council." Diocesan and parochial organizations were to be effected on the central model, with spiritual powers in the local spheres delegated to bishops and priests.

The problem of the consecration of bishops was temporarily solved by the laying-on-of-hands by fellow presbyters. The inadequacy of such consecrations was recognized by Mons. Aglipay and his associates, and immediate negotiations were opened with the Anglicans, and the Old Catholics of Switzerland, with the hope of obtaining valid orders. Unfortunately, due to the stress of the times, Aglipay became impatient over the delays in the negotiations, and himself accepted consecration at the hands of six of his fellow bishops, whose consecration had been at the hands of presbyters. His hasty and irregular consecration complicated the negotiations with Bishop Hertzog of the Old Catholic Church of Switzerland, as well as those initiated with Bishop Brent, Missionary Bishop of the Philippines of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Moreover, Bishop Brent was disturbed by what he interpreted as a lack of frankness on the part of Bishop Aglipay, and by the fanatic nationalism which characterized the Iglesia Filipina Independiente in its early days. No doubt there was a clash of personalities, which was unfortunate but almost inevitable when one considers the background of the two men. Bishop Brent had but recently arrived in the Philippines, and was unaccustomed to the circumlocution of the Oriental mind. Mons. Aglipay, on the other hand, was

a typical Oriental and unaccustomed to making simple, direct statements. Then, too, Bishop Brent was undoubtedly influenced by the American official attitude of the times towards nationalistic ambitions of Asiatic peoples. Whatever the cause to the setback in the negotiations for valid orders, it resulted in the important question being left in abeyance for a number of years, with the consequent isolation of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente from the main stream of orthodox Christianity. The clergy and laity accepted the irregular orders as a *modus vivendi*, while retaining the hope that at some future time they would be regularized and their Church brought into close association with the Catholic Churches of Christendom.

Mons. Gregorio Aglipay—Obispo Maximo

With the consecration of Mons. Gregorio Aglipay on January 18, 1903, the spiritual and temporal affairs of the Church were cast into the mold which shaped them for the next forty years. His training and experience, no less than his magnetic commanding personality, destined him for practically dictatorial leadership of the newly organized Church. So strongly was the impress of his personality felt throughout the Church that in common parlance to this day it is spoken of as the "Aglipayan Church." He was the St. Paul of the movement, shaping its organization and doctrine.

One of his first official acts was the revocation of the "Provisional Constitution" of 1902, and, with the consent of the governing body, the promulgation of "The Doctrine and Constitutional Rules," which, together with the "Six Fundamental Epistles" (four written by Aglipay, and two by Isabelo de los Reyes, and addressed to the Filipino clergy and laity), became the "Supreme Law" of the Church. Both were general in character and were to be supplemented by the canon law of the Roman Catholic Church, which was to apply in the governing of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente "in so far as it was applicable." It will be seen that this decision left much to the discretion of the Obispo Maximo and his associates in the episcopate. In assessing this rather faulty arrangement for the administration of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, it must be remembered that these men had had no experience in democratic administration, that at this time they were ignorant of the polity of any save that of the Roman Church, and that they were confronted with a flood of new learning. The Protestant bodies and the Unitarians were urging them to abandon completely the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Roman Church, and either unite with one of their bodies or to establish another Protestant sect. If they failed to heed such advice

(which some secretly hoped), then the Protestant bodies believed they would gather the fruit of Iglesia Filipina Independiente rebellion against Rome. "Aglipay will shake the tree and we will gather the fruit," a statement often heard in those days, expressed the attitude of the contemporary missionaries. However, in spite of their suffering at the hands of Rome, and while conscious of many of the faults of the Roman Church, they held steadfastly to their Catholic heritage.

In the Preface to the "Constitutional Rules," three reasons are clearly stated for establishing the Iglesia Filipina Independiente. In its God-ward aspect, its purpose was declared to be to re-establish in its full splendor the worship of God and to teach His Word, which they considered necessary because of "a deplorable degradation" of worship and the Scriptures under the obscuratism of the Roman Church; while, in its man-ward aspects, its stated purpose was to seek to emancipate the human conscience from "error and unscientific scruples contrary to natural law," and to restore to man the right of free will; also, to restore to the Filipino clergy the dignity, rights, and prerogatives of which they had been deprived through exploitation and discrimination.

The "Rules" affirmed the acceptance of the faith as taught by the Roman Church in all that does not contradict the Word of God, the natural law, and the judgment of reason.

As to worship and ceremonial rites, these were to follow the usage of Rome in so far as they were not repugnant to Holy Scripture.

The symbols of the Holy Trinity were to take precedence over the images and symbols of the saints and the Blessed Virgin.

The Holy Mass was to follow exactly the Roman liturgy, but to be read audibly. Instruction and prayers were to be given in the language of the people. The Ordinal was to be the same as in the Roman Church, with only slight changes in the pledge and oath of the bishop-elect.

During Aglipay's tenure of office, we see the Iglesia Filipina Independiente dominated and held to its course by a man biased by his years of rigid training in the Roman Catholic Church, seeking to understand democratic ideas and ideals, intellectually alerted to the existence of a more liberal philosophy and theology, pressured by the protestant bodies, condemned by Rome, misunderstood by other branches of the Catholic Church, and a suspect, because of his ardent nationalism, by the American civil authorities. As a result, the Iglesia Filipina Independiente became more and more isolated from the main stream of orthodox Christianity, and, of necessity, steered its own course along familiar channels, borrowing heavily from its Roman Catholic experience. While the supremacy of the pope had been reluctantly renounced, the Apostolic

Orders of the ministry had been retained in the hope of future validation. The canon law of the Roman Church remained in effect, except as modified or nullified by the Constitution and Fundamental Epistles, and the theology and worship of the Roman Church were accepted until such time as the Iglesia Filipina Independiente could determine what was to be retained and what rejected. In other words, the religious life of the faithful was left undisturbed as much as possible under their elected leaders. The Church vehemently proclaimed its catholicity, and considered itself the rightful heir to the parish churches and other properties.

Approaches to Other Churches

It was inevitable that Mons. Aglipay should retain a strong predilection for Catholic Orders and suffer misgivings about the irregularity of his own consecration. This is borne out by his correspondence with various branches of the Catholic Church. Soon after taking office as Obispo Maximo, he is quoted as saying to the secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society that he hoped, by introducing gradual reforms into the Roman system, the Iglesia Filipina Independiente de las Islas Filipinas would grow into a replica of the Church of England. To this end, after several conferences with Charles Henry Brent, Missionary Bishop of the Philippines of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., on June 17, 1904, he addressed the following letter to Bishop Brent, then enroute to General Convention :

TO THE VENERABLE ASSEMBLY OF BISHOPS OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES

In the name of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, of which I am the Opispo Maximo, and through the most worthy Bishop Brent, I have the honor to convey to the Venerable Assembly of Bishops of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America, the homage of our affectionate confraternity in God, and imploring the aid of your prayers that our Heavenly Father may guide our newly born and humble National Church through the paths of His divine will, by the light of the Holy Spirit, which we trust to obtain through the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, by earnestly preaching His evangelical lessons of saintliness, love and moral and social redemption.

We hereby whole-heartedly offer to our beloved brethren of America our humble cooperation and more especially our unselfish and enthusiastic alliance for the humanitarian task of evangelizing the Filipinos, through the study of the Holy Scriptures cleansed from all deceitful and worldly commentaries, and without pretensions to improve or correct the unimprovable.

With full trust that the Venerable Assembly of the Episcopal Church, to which I hereby address myself, shall welcome our earnest

aims and affectionate greetings, I declare myself in the service of all the Christian faithful of America, as their affectionate brother.

(signed) GREGORIO AGLIPAY,

Obispo Maximo of the
Iglesia Filipina Independiente

Appended to the copy of the above letter, in the archives of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, is a note in Aglipay's own handwriting, stating that "Another letter in similar terms has been forwarded to Bishop Hertzog, dated June 1, 1904." And a second note reading, "Another letter was delivered to Bishop Brent (Episcopal Church), asking his help in bringing to the Philippines one bishop from the Old Catholic Church, another from the Anglican, and one from the Episcopal Church of the United States of America, for the bestowal to our Episcopate of the gift of Apostolic Succession." Both the letter and the appended notes are in Spanish.

To the above, Bishop Brent responded as follows:

S. S. Zieten
Indian Ocean, July 10, 1904.

EL OBISPO MAXIMO,
GREGORIO AGLIPAY,
MANILA, P.I.

Dear Bishop Aglipay:

As I re-read your communications to the House of Bishops and myself respectively, I am convinced that they are too vague to justify any official action on our part—indeed I myself would advise against it.

1.—Unless it is distinctly stated for what a commission is requested, no self-respecting body could think of sending one. A mere invitation for representatives of our Church and others to come to see you is a pleasant courtesy and nothing more. If your last letter had in it some such phrase as this: 'a commission to confer with me and other bishops of the Independent Filipino Church, or with the Supreme Council, and to examine into the possibility of our establishing communion with you,' the whole ground would be covered.

2.—I have read with care and interest your statement of doctrine, morals and Church polity. Considering the important place in government accorded therein to your Supreme Council, it would appear as though any steps looking toward intercommunion should have the endorsement of that body. I am of the opinion that the House of Bishops would hesitate to do anything unless it has assurance of such endorsement. Of course, I may be mistaken as to the extent to which authority in matters of this kind is vested in you.

But the point is this—your letters call for nothing. I understand that taken in conjunction with what you have said to me in conversations, the second one has a significance which it would not

possess otherwise; but that is neither here nor there. If you are in earnest, you ought to be as frank on paper as you have been in conference. In matters that pertain to the Church of God, honesty of motive and straightforwardness of an action should go hand in hand. If you trust me and the honorable body which I represent, you must commit your cause to us in intelligible language. As I understand your position, you desire to place the Independent Filipino Church in organic relation with historic Christinity. There is but one way to do this; viz., that which I have already indicated. Neither the Greek, Anglican, Old Catholic, nor our own Church could take any other course. If you are desirous of having a commission, please say so and I shall use my influence to secure its appointment. Of course I might fail; and there is another contingency that the commission, when appointed, might come to the Philippines only to discover that terms of communion could not be agreed upon. But in any event no harm would result. Any communication you may have to make should reach me not later than the first week in October. The session of General Convention closes about the 19th. The House of Bishops will probably have a meeting still later and could consider such propositions as might be laid before them. But it would be preferable to have whatever is to be done put through the General Convention.

My address will be: Church Missions House, 281 Fourth Avenue, New York.

I remain yours faithfully,

(Signed) CHARLES H. BRENT,
Bishop of the Missionary
District of the Philippine Islands

Commenting on the conference between Mons. Aglipay and Bishop Brent and the above correspondence, the present Obispo Maximo, Mons. Isabelo de los Reyes, Jr., who at the time was secretary to Mons. Aglipay, said,

"It was tragic that Bishop Aglipay, who knew not a word of English, and Bishop Brent, who knew no Spanish, were forced to communicate through interpreters, most of whom at the time were Roman Catholics. This lack of a common language created confusion and misunderstanding between the American and Filipino bishops and led to an impasse, despite the fact that both were motivated by the best of intentions and were equally zealous to bring the two Churches into close fellowship."

The following excerpts from letters addressed to Mons. Aglipay by the Rt. Rev. Edward Hertzog of the Old Catholic Church, dated at Berne, Switzerland, in the years 1903 and 1904, seem somewhat more cordial than the response of Bishop Brent, due perhaps to less concern about the nationalistic element in the movement:

"It seems to me that those national churches should be in brotherly union to show the world that it is possible to be catholic everywhere

without submission to Rome. As a sign of my brotherly feelings, I send you the list of my clergy.

"The next summer we shall have here at Berne an international Congress, to which all independent Catholic Churches are invited. I shall send you an invitation as soon as the time of the gathering is fixed. It would be very important if you and some other bishops could come.

"In the 'Katholik' of this day I have spoken of your work. For our own readers it would be most interesting to know by whom and when you received your episcopal consecration. We are very anxious to show to the world that our independence from Rome does not hinder us to be good catholics.

"I am very thankful for your declaration that you accept the idea to establish a closer union between us. Of course, this union does not in the least restrain the full independence of your Church. We only wish the recognition of brotherly fellowship, which shall subsist between Churches who reach the catholic faith and maintain in their constitution and liturgy the catholic tradition. In 1889 the Old Catholic bishops of Holland, Germany and Switzerland formulated a declaration of faith and stipulated some rules about the mutual relation between our Churches. I will send you, if possible, in the next days not only the German text, but also a Spanish translation. You would not be obliged to anything other than that done by those of our continent.

"The Roman newspapers say that your Church has given up the Apostolic Succession. That is, I think, not true. We Old Catholics in Europe would be quite lost by renouncing this mark of catholicity.

"Our Congress is in full preparation. It would be a fact of very great importance to the world and our Churches if you could assist. We would have many things to discuss.

"Are you not in friendly relations with the Episcopal Church of the United States? Our Congress would probably be a good occasion for deliberation with some men of authority.

"Now I think it would be a very good means to establish a closer union between us, if you could send some students or young priests of good manners to finish their studies at our school and to make acquaintance with our Church.

"I send you a Spanish translation of the rules by which the relation between the Old Catholic bishops has been regulated. The same rules are now also accepted by the Old Catholic Church of Austria.

"The most important document is the 'Declaration of Faith.' If you can accept that declaration, the other conditions are of no weight.

"Now I desire very much that you come to our reunion on the first of September. We shall have guests from the Oriental and Occidental Church. By your presence our assembly would have an ecumenical character.

"With deep satisfaction, and with sincere thanks to God, we have taken note of the great success with which God blesses your en-

deavor to procure ecclesiastical authority for the Filipinos without abandoning the Catholic doctrine or injuring the constitution of the Catholic Church.

"As our fellow-bishop, Edward Hertzog, informs us, you are in possession of the Creed addressed by us to the Catholic Church on the 24th of November 1889, as well as of the agreements by which on the same day we have regulated our ecclesiastical relations among one another. You will see from the above, that although we reject the false doctrines, the pretensions to power and the abuses of the papacy, we strictly adhere to the Catholic doctrine, the Constitution of the Church and the liturgy.

"The islands that form the home of your people are too far from the countries of our own Churches for a frequent personal intercourse to be possible; but the 'bond of peace,' which, according to the teaching of the Apostle, shall unite the faithful, is able, despite distances, to join us in one communion. This communion does not impair in any way the full autonomy of the national churches.

"Without wishing to derogate from the independence of your Church, or to forestall your own judgment as to that which benefits your Church, we beg to call your attention above all to our adhering to the Apostolic Succession. We therefore are of the opinion that a Church can only be considered a Catholic Church, if its bishops have been consecrated by other Catholic bishops. If the bishops of your Church should hitherto not have received the Catholic consecration, we would address to you the urgent entreaty to be mindful of supplying this want."³

While the negotiations with the Protestant Episcopal Church through Bishop Brent, and with the Old Catholic Church through Bishop Hertzog, did not result in the validation of the orders of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, they no doubt served to confirm Bishop Aglipay's conviction that valid orders was an essential element in a Catholic Church. Indirectly, these contacts with two branches of the Catholic Church, as well as similar contacts with some of the smaller Churches claiming a Catholic heritage, strengthened the determination of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente to orient its Church towards the Catholic, rather than the Protestant, groups. What Dr. Frank Lauback in his book, *The People of the Philippines*, says is doubtless true: "The Episcopal Church proved a factor at least for a time, in forming the ideals of the Filipino Bishop" (Aglipay). It remained for Bishop Aglipay's successors to follow up these early contacts in a calmer atmosphere and bring them to a successful conclusion.

For a while, Bishop Aglipay, attracted by the whole-hearted proffer of friendship by the Unitarian Church of America, and impatient of the drawn-out negotiations with branches of the Catholic Church, be-

³ Sent in the name of the Old Catholic Episcopal Conference, September 1, 1904.

came strongly Unitarian in his thinking. During this period, he published a number of books and pamphlets doctrinally Unitarian and attempted to impose his new ideas on his Church. However, the great mass of the people of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente remained true to their Catholic heritage, and only a very limited number fell under the influence of the new theology. Most of these, together with the bishop, later abandoned Unitarian theology. It is difficult to assess Bishop Aglipay's Unitarian convictions, because even during this period churches were dedicated to the Blessed Trinity. No doubt his admiration for Governor-General Taft played a part in it. The present Obispo Maximo, Isabelo de los Reyes, Jr., commenting on this phase in Aglipay's spiritual pilgrimage says:

"Only the American Unitarians, under the influence of Governor-General Taft, remained friendly and cooperative. This Unitarian steadfastness in the face of adversity strongly influenced both Bishop Aglipay and de los Reyes (father of the present Obispo Maximo) towards a radical unorthodox interpretation of religion. A small, but highly influential minority within the Church was contaminated with Unitarianism, though the overwhelming majority of clergy and laity remained loyal to their Catholic and Apostolic faith and practice."

Loss of Church Property

In cases where entire congregations and their priests seceded from the Roman Church, they assumed the right of continued use of all church buildings and properties. The Roman Church naturally demanded the restoration of these properties. Dr. Cornish, in his book *The Philippines Calling*, says, concerning this issue:

"Who owned the great stone churches built by whole communities under friar rule? Who owned the parish buildings and the cemeteries? Every man in each community had annually been obliged to give thirty days of work without pay. And, as the tally on the thirty full days was always kept by the friar, it is alleged that many men gave far more than even the allotted time. The women also worked and without pay. Both men and women labored under the whip. Certain it is that these great churches were built by labor neither voluntary nor paid. Whole communities had now gone over to the Independent Church, together with their Filipino priests, continuing their occupancy of the church properties. The Roman Church demanded restoration. Were the church properties owned by the communities in which they stood, or by Rome? It was a burning question, threatening civil war. To relieve the situation, Governor Taft issued a proclamation of 'Peaceful Possession.' Pending the decision of the courts, it decreed that whoever was in possession was the rightful occupant. After litigation, beginning in 1906 and

lasting into 1908, the highest court decreed that the title to all the Philippine Church property was vested in Rome. The authority of the Treaty of Paris was also claimed for this decision. However right it may have been legally, and the impartiality of investigating commissions and of the court has been widely questioned, we should understand the moral justification for the Aglipayan contentions. The Independent Church held:

"Since the people had built the churches by forced labor, the churches should belong to the people who built them, or to their successors. They should be the properties of the communities where they stood. The people of these communities, having transferred their allegiance from the Roman to the Independent Church, the properties should belong to the Independent Church."

"Since Pope Alexander VI in 1493 gave to the Kings of Spain the Roman Catholic churches in the Spanish Colonies, and since Church and State were then one, it followed that the United States now owned the churches, and therefore they should be used for public (that is religious) purposes, maintaining the status quo at the time of Governor-General Taft's proclamation of Peaceful Possession."

According to Bishop de los Reyes, Jr., the effect of the court's decision proved almost fatal, not only to the newly established Church, but also to the forward march of democracy in the Philippines. One of the central assertions of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente had been that the will of the people was the law of the land. The judicial blow to such political and religious faith caused the desertion of many who were reluctant to abandon worship within the majestic churches constructed through the forced labor of the people of the Islands. However, Bishop Aglipay and a defiant majority of the Church remained steadfastly determined to repudiate the friars and the pope, and withstood the cruel test with bold hearts. They began to worship in humble but free buildings. A few weeks after the return of the old churches to Rome, modest chapels were constructed in many parts of the Philippines. Millions of Filipinos remained proudly loyal to the Independent Church. Today, about six hundred parish churches and over two thousand rural chapels, built by voluntary effort and contributions from the people, stand as a witness to the glory of God and the freedom of His people. A truly eloquent and magnificent manifestation of an independent Church in an independent nation.

Liturgical and Doctrinal Conflict Within the Iglesia Filipina Independiente

As has been stated, when the Iglesia Filipina Independiente renounced its allegiance to the pope and freed itself from the tyranny

of the Spanish hierarchy, neither in theory nor practice did it abandon its belief in Catholic doctrine, discipline, or worship. It emerged from its conflict with Rome, as has been said of the Church of England, "with rent cordage and tattered sails, but still unmistakably an integral unit of the Church universal, flying the old flag, set on the old course, manned by the old crew and obeying the same Captain."

For the first six years, Latin remained the official language for divine worship, and the celibacy of the clergy was enforced. The founders of the young Church, having failed to reform the Roman Church from within, nevertheless were careful to preserve intact for their Church the entire inheritance of the Church they intended to replace. Strong attempts were made to bring the clergy and laity to break with tradition and Catholic doctrine, but all these came to nought, due to the strong pull of the inherited faith and lack of conviction regarding Unitarianism, or what, to the Oriental mind of the Filipinos at that time, seemed as the dry evangelism of the Protestant Churches.

In 1906, the *Oficio Divino* was printed in Spain under the direction of Isabolo de los Reyes and approved by the governing body as the official book of worship of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente. The compilers of this book borrowed heavily from the Anglican Book of Common Prayer and the Roman Missal, while at the same time, under the Unitarian influence, introducing certain radical and unorthodox elements. The Real Presence was denied, and the Mass became a mere service of commemoration of the Last Supper. These radical elements in the Liturgy, bordering on Sabellianism, were not, however, acceptable to the vast majority of the clergy, which resulted in the Church being theoretically Sabellian, but Trinitarian in practice. This confusing development may be better understood by remembering that de los Reyes was a rationalist, Aglipay a bold reformer, while the bishops and clergy were all ex-Roman Catholic priests, unacquainted with the rationalistic trends of thought.

In the year 1909, the first part of a *Filipino Bible* was printed by de los Reyes in Spain, and became an official book of the Church. It was an attempt to explain creation by the prevalent theory of evolution, as expounded by Darwin. Only a hundred copies were printed, and it was never distributed to the clergy or the laity. The second part was never published, and the *Biblia Filipina* became a mere collector's item.

In 1912, a *Catechesis*, with an interesting prologue by the famous ex-Roman Catholic priest, Jose Ferrandiz, came to light. It was edited in Manila by de los Reyes, and embodied the same radical and rationalistic tenets as the *Oficio Divino* and the *Biblia Filipina*, and made a significant impression upon a limited number of intellectuals. However,

by then it had become an established policy of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente clergy to ignore the radical theology and philosophy of Aglipay and de los Reyes, and to continue to instruct the laity in the accustomed Catholic doctrine and practices. Bishop Aglipay's heroic nationalism and earnestness compelled even the most conservative of his faithful followers to look with a measure of indulgence upon tenets, which he, himself, was careful not to force upon anyone. At his death on September 1, 1940, the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, facing a new generation educated in the public schools, stood a contradiction unto itself. On the one hand, it embodied a minority group infected with Unitarianism and Sabellianism, loyal to the *Oficio Divino*, the *Biblia Filipina*, and the *Catechesis*, while, on the other hand, it embodied the formidable majority of bishops, priests, and laity firmly adhering to Catholic faith and practice, buttressing their stand by reference to the Holy Bible and the Fundamental Epistles (never abrogated), the sixth of which concludes with these words :

"Holy, holy, holy, Eternal Trinity, to Whom we owe our religious liberty!

Full are the heavens, the earth and the whole creation of Thy glory!
Amen."

Both groups retained their strong nationalism, which in these post-colonial days is considered an asset rather than a liability.

Orthodox Group Assumes Leadership

This liturgical and doctrinal confusion continued until the election of Isabelo de los Reyes, Jr., on October 24, 1946, to the office of Obispo Maximo. Although the son of the rationalistic and influential Isabelo de los Reyes, he shared none of his father's radical ideas, and immediately upon assumption of office, with the loyal support of the overwhelming majority of his Church, started to cleanse the Church of all traces of Unitarianism, and to bring its liturgy and doctrine in line with the main stream of orthodox Christianity.

Under his leadership, the General Assembly of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, meeting in Manila on August 5, 1947, adopted a "Declaration of Faith and Articles of Religion" and a "Constitution."

The "Declaration of Faith" contains twenty-one Articles, unequivocally asserting the Church's belief in :

The Holy Trinity.
Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God.
The Holy Ghost.
One, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

The Holy Scriptures as containing all things necessary to salvation.
 The Seven Sacraments—Baptism and Holy Communion generally held to be necessary to salvation.
 The Three Apostolic Orders of the Ministry.

Other articles set forth the Church's position in regard to :

The right of the clergy to marry.
 The consecration of Church buildings.
 Worship, Rites and Ceremonies.
 The conduct of public services in the language of the people.
 Purity of life.
 God as the source of all truth.
 The Blessed Virgin as the Mother of Jesus Christ and therefore the Mother of God in His human generation.
 Veneration of the Saints.
 Miracles.
 Attitude towards the Roman Church.
 Attitude towards other Churches.
 Separation of Church and State.
 Doctrine and Constitutional Rules of the Church and the Fundamental Epistles.
 Additions, Amendments, and Repeal of the Declaration of Faith.

The Constitution contains four Articles, providing for :

A General Assembly.
 A Supreme Council of Bishops.
 A Supreme Bishop—Obispo Maximo.
 Amendments.

This is supplemented by "Canons for the Government of the Philippine Independent Church." They are divided into four parts, which set forth regulations in regard to : The Clergy ; the Sacraments ; Sacred Places ; the laity.

Upon the promulgation of the "Declaration of Faith" and the "Constitution and Canons," the Obispo Maximo, Isabelo de los Reyes, Jr., issued the following *Pastoral*:

Consistent with the faith and will of an overwhelming majority of our people and clergy, the Supreme Council of Bishops and the General Assembly of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente have unanimously approved and confirmed at their special sessions of August 4th and 5th, 1947, respectively, a solemn Declaration of Faith and the Articles of Religion whereby our Church officially proclaims its exalted faith in the Holy Trinity as contained in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds ; the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures as containing all things necessary to salvation, and the seven sacraments.

These fundamental tenets of our Christian Faith have been adopted and proclaimed by the supreme legislative bodies of our Church in perfect accordance with the provisions of our ecclesiastical Constitution, and thus it has become the duty of all the bishops, priests, and lay members of our Church to believe in the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ and in all other articles of the Apostles' Creed.

Likewise, the Supreme Council of Bishops and the General Assembly have unanimously resolved to petition the Episcopal Church of the United States of America, a branch of the Anglican Communion, for the gift of Apostolic Succession to our episcopate. This action is the happy outcome of negotiations started more than forty years ago by our founder and first *Obispo Maximo*, the late Mons. Gregorio Aglipay, in the course of which an active and historic correspondence was started with Archbishop Herzog of Switzerland, Bishop Miraglia of Italy, Bishop Brent of the Philippines, and outstanding prelates of the Orthodox Churches of the world. It was during the course of these negotiations that Mons. Aglipay conferred in 1931 with some bishops of the Old Catholic Church in the United States, and in 1934, while in Europe, interviewed important prelates of the Orthodox Churches in Germany. This correspondence, including letters from Mons. Aglipay asking for Apostolic Succession, has fortunately survived the war, and is kept in the records of our central office in Manila.

Through these memorable decisions of our Supreme Council of Bishops and the General Assembly, our beloved Iglesia Filipina Independiente has placed itself within the fold of historic Christianity. We sincerely trust that the documents published hereby will be welcomed by our people, and that if any criticism is forthcoming it be in the spirit of genuine Christian truth-seeking and loyalty to our Church.

(Signed) ISABELO DE LOS REYES, JR.
Obispo Maximo

Negotiations Reopened with the Protestant Episcopal Church

Shortly after the outbreak of World War II, and a few days before the entry of the Imperial Japanese Army into Manila, Mons. Isabolo de los Reyes, Jr., and Mons. Santiago Fonancier called on the Missionary Bishop of the Philippines of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., Dr. Norman Spencer Binsted, seeking advice as to how to deal with the Japanese. On that occasion, Bishop Binsted questioned the visiting bishops on the theological position of their Church, more particularly as to its position in regard to the Holy Trinity. He asked if their people were baptized in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. He was told that in the early days of the movement it was customary to baptize candidates only in the Name of the Lord Jesus, but that in recent years it was the custom of the Church to baptize them in the

Name of the Holy Trinity. He was also told that the Iglesia Filipina Independiente was in the course of rethinking its theological position. The occupation of the Philippines terminated any further intercourse between the bishops of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente and the missionary bishop of the Philippines until the Japanese Army had been driven out of Manila. In the meantime, Mons. Isabolo de los Reyes had been elected to the office of Obispo Maximo.

On October 24, 1946, Bishop Binsted, together with the Suffragan Bishop of the Philippines, the Rt. Rev. Robert F. Wilner, D.D., at the request of the Obispo Maximo, held an informal conference with him and Bishops Gerardo M. Byaca and Juan P. Kitano. At this conference, the Obispo Maximo said the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, while strong in its admiration for the integrity, courage, and leadership of its founder, no longer held certain Unitarian doctrines which had been held and to some extent propagated by Bishop Aglipay, but is Trinitarian, and desires to place itself in organic relation with historic Christianity. As a step towards this end, he requested permission to use the Book of Common Prayer in their churches, and, if possible, that Iglesia Filipina Independiente theological students be educated in the Episcopal Church Seminary, soon to be established in Manila. He also stated that the Iglesia Filipina Independiente bishops and clergy accepted without reservation the four points of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, and that their bishops would welcome consecration at the hands of Anglican bishops, after which they would re-ordain such priests of their Church as had not already received valid ordination in the Roman Catholic Church prior to entering the Iglesia Filipina Independiente. The discussions which took place at this conference were reported to the then Presiding Bishop, Dr. Henry St. George Tucker, by Bishop Binsted in a letter dated October 29, 1946. As the Presiding Bishop's term of office was due to expire on December 31, 1946, this important matter was held over for the consideration of his successor, the Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, D.D.

On January 20, 1947, Bishop Sherrill addressed the following letter to Bishop Binsted:

My dear Bishop Binsted:

When Bishop Tucker left the office, he left the material contained in your letter of October 29th in regard to your relationship with the Philippine Independent Church. Today your telegram has come: "Would appreciate acknowledgment my letter October 29th regarding Philippine Independent Church."

I am somewhat at a loss to know how to reply to this, as I have not been in the situation at all, and I should like to find out from Bishop Tucker just what progress, if any, he has made. But I am

quite clear in my own mind that this is a matter which should come before the House of Bishops at our meeting the first week in November.

What I would definitely suggest is that all this material be put into shape and the matter presented to the House of Bishops for their discussion and recommendation. In the meantime I shall be glad to consult with the Advisory Council on Ecclesiastical Relations.

I am sorry that this is such an indefinite answer, but it is the best that I can do today, which happens to be my first day in the office.

With every good wish,

Faithfully yours,

(signed) HENRY SHERRILL,
Presiding Bishop

Upon receipt of the above letter, a more formal conference was held with the Obispo Maximo, five diocesan bishops, and a leading layman of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, on February 26, 1947. At this conference, Bishop Binsted made it clear that before he could present any petition from the Iglesia Filipina Independiente to the Protestant Episcopal Church requesting the bestowal of Apostolic Orders upon that Church, it would be necessary for the governing body of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente to clearly state:

1. The present doctrinal position of the Church.
2. The polity of the Church.
3. That it was the desire of the Governing Body to receive consecration of their bishops at the hands of bishops of the Episcopal Church.

Bishop Binsted suggested that if and when such official action had been taken by the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, the probable procedure would be:

1. The petition of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente would be presented to the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church through the Bishop of the Philippines.
2. The presiding Bishop would present the petition to the Advisory Council on Ecclesiastical Relations for study.
3. The Council would then make such recommendations as it saw fit to the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church.
4. The House of Bishops might defer action on the proposals until after the Lambeth Conference of 1948.
5. In that event, the proposals would be placed on the agenda for discussion at Lambeth.
6. The House of Bishops might then take action on the proposals.

In informing the Presiding Bishop of the results of this conference, Bishop Binsted commented as follows:

"If and when the Philippine Independent Church officially petitions the Protestant Episcopal Church for the Consecration of the Bishops, and this request has been granted, the Philippine Independent Church would maintain its independent status, but would work in the closest cooperation with the Philippine Episcopal Church. We would both use the Book of Common Prayer. There would be intercommunion; there would be joint conferences of the representatives of both Churches; the theological students of both Churches would be educated in one Seminary; and plans for evangelization would be formulated at joint conferences of the representatives of both Churches."

On August 4, 1947, at a meeting of the Supreme Council of Bishops of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, Bishop Binsted summarized the results thus far of the conferences held with the Obispo Maximo and other leaders of the Church. As this had a direct bearing on the action taken by the Council, it is quoted in full:

"Late in 1941, and again in 1945, I had the pleasure of meeting your Supreme Bishop, Mons. de los Reyes, Jr. In 1941, he called on me in my office with Bishop Fonacier to ask me what I thought would happen to the Christian Churches if the Japanese Army occupied the Philippines. In 1945, we met with Christian leaders of other Churches to discuss Christian educational problems. Then, beginning last fall, I have had the pleasure of meeting with the Supreme Bishop and other leaders of your Church from time to time to discuss the possibility of closer cooperation between the Philippine Independent Church and the Philippine Episcopal Church.

"Perhaps I am indebted to the Japanese Army for bringing us together. I believe, however, that there were more powerful forces at work, and that our first subsequent meetings were due to the leading of the Holy Spirit. Whatever the power that was bringing us closer together, and whether our conversations centered around problems of Japanese occupation, Christian education, or that subject which called forth that short and beautiful prayer of our Blessed Lord, 'that they all may be one,' our conversations were characterized by complete frankness, honesty, and Christian courtesy.

"Like a true Shepherd, your Supreme Bishop has shown Christ-like concern for the welfare of his Church and the people committed to his care. His qualities of leadership, combined with a beautiful spirit of humility, have made me conscious of my own inadequacy. I think we both felt the Presence of the Master with us as we talked of the things pertaining to the Kingdom.

"In all my conversations with the Supreme Bishop and the other leaders of your Church, I have spoken as one member of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., and

entirely on my own responsibility. I have, however, fully informed the Presiding Bishop of my Church of the substance and tenor of our conversations, so that should your Church see fit to present any petition or request to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., he would have knowledge of the conferences which led to the presentation of such a petition or request.

"I am informed that a petition requesting valid Episcopal Consecration for your bishops may be presented to the Church in America as the result of action to be taken at the meeting of the Supreme Council of Bishops and the General Assembly now in session. I must warn you of the time element involved in the consideration of such a petition, if and when it is presented. The petition would be received and acknowledged by the Presiding Bishop of the Church in the U.S.A., who would then transmit it to our Committee on Ecclesiastical Relations with Other Churches. This Committee, in the course of its study, may ask for clarification of certain matters in regard to your Church. Then the Committee, having completed the study of the petition, would make a report to the House of Bishops, who would in turn study the petition. It might then, by action of the House of Bishops, be referred to the Lambeth Conference, which meets in England in 1948, for consideration and advice. If the Lambeth Conference make favorable recommendations, the petition would then probably go to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., which is scheduled to meet in San Francisco in 1949, for final action. I suggest this possible course of action so that you may be prepared for the length of time you may have to wait before receiving final answer to any petition which may be placed before my Church.

"I would not presume to predict what such final action may be, but as a member of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, I am prepared to support the petition which I understand may be approved by this General Assembly before the various bodies of the Anglican Communion who may have it under consideration. Personally, I see no reason why my Church should not take favorable action on it.

"In the meantime, there are a number of ways in which the Philippine Independent Church and the Philippine Episcopal Church may cooperate for the Glory of God and the furtherance of His Kingdom in these Islands. I suggest some of the following:

1. The education of men for the Sacred Ministry. The Philippine Episcopal Church will be happy to receive into its Seminary such candidates for the Sacred Ministry as may be recommended by the Supreme Bishop.
2. When we open our school for the Training of Women Church Workers, we shall be glad to receive into that school such women of your Church as you may wish trained.
3. Conference for the study of mutual problems.
4. Retreats for Clergy and Laity.

5. Teaching Missions among our people.
6. A combined Religious Book Store.

Other suggestions for cooperation will doubtless occur to the leaders of both Churches under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

"Now, permit me to make a few general remarks, which I believe are pertinent to the occasion. The Protestant Episcopal Church is a daughter of the Church of England. The Church was in the British Isles before the coming of the missionaries from Rome. Like your own Church, for a long period of time it was completely under the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Church. At the time of the Reformation, the Church in England asserted her independence of foreign control, but she did not renounce nor forfeit her heritage as a Catholic Church. She retained Catholic doctrine, discipline, and worship, and remained within the stream of historic Christianity. She gave to the people the Bible and the services of the Church in their own language, and re-emphasized the right of the Christian to direct approach to God through Jesus Christ. Through the guidance of the Holy Spirit, she sought to correct such errors and abuses as had crept into the Church, as she has continued to do ever since, and to make amends for her failures, so that she may more perfectly conform to the Mind of God and faithfully fulfill the mission imposed upon her by her Lord.

"Your Church has had an honorable history. It has contended with persecution from without and difficulties within. It was born in a day when nationalism was at its height and some of your leaders as a reaction to the obscurantism to which they had been exposed, came strongly under its influence. Then, too, your Church came into being when great statesmen of these Islands were in rebellion against foreign oppression. It was inevitable that your early leaders should make common cause with such men.

"However, through all the stress and strain of political and intellectual revolution, it is evident that God held you very closely to Himself and caused you to cherish the Faith once for all delivered to the Apostles.

"I understand that you may take action at this General Assembly clarifying the position of your Church on matters of doctrine, discipline, and worship, and that you may then seek Episcopal Consecration from the hands of Anglican Bishops. If and when this is granted, you need have no further concern about the position of your Church among the historic Catholic Churches of the world. Such a development will not mean that you have reached perfection, but it will mean that you have the fulness of grace, of life, and of power which Christ committed to His Church. And as the Holy Spirit has worked among you in times past, so He will continue to work, guiding, blessing, and purifying your Church, that it may be worthy of the high purpose for which, under God's Providence, I am sure it is destined. Your Church is already integrated into the life of this Republic. You have a great body of Bishops, Priests, and Laity. You have knowledge of the language, customs, and psy-

chology of your own people as no missionary from the outside will ever have. We missionaries can bring you those wider contacts with the Church Universal and the benefit of the experience of the Church in other lands. This we can do and will do gladly, but the true faith of the Catholic Church can eventually best be conveyed to the people of the Philippines by their own people.

"Your Church and my Church will remain truly Catholic as day by day our members are sanctified by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. We must hold fast to the Faith once for all delivered to the Apostles and strive constantly to banish from the Church all strange and erroneous teaching, and seek to keep it free from all pagan accretions, which are contrary to the Mind of God as revealed by our Lord Jesus Christ, and which lead to fanaticism, which is destructive to true worship. We must avoid rigid uniformity in worship, which imperils the life of the Spirit; but all our teaching, acts of worship and discipline should be tested by the life and teaching of Jesus. For this reason, we must constantly refer to the Holy Scriptures for proof of that which we teach.

"Above all, we must keep in mind that the Church was founded by Christ for the salvation of men. He chose to work in and through it to win men from a life of sin to a life of righteousness and purity. Therefore, along with the teaching of the Apostles, we must inculcate the zeal of the Apostles in the hearts of our people, and inspire them to work for the salvation of others. The Church, if it is truly Catholic, is the Body of Christ, a living organism, which causes eternal life to pulsate in the life of its members.

"If, under the Providence of God, your Church enters the family of the world's historic Churches, our two Churches working together in these Islands can present to the people of the Philippines a type of Catholicism familiar to those centuries which produced the great Fathers of the Church, which will have a valid priesthood, but not be priest-ridden, and which accepts Catholic tradition but keeps it purged by free use of reason and constant appeal to the Scriptures.

"My brethren, we are entering upon a great adventure in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We must pray for strength, courage, wisdom, patience, and humility necessary to the accomplishment of the objective we have undertaken. And may our striving for greater cooperation between our two Churches bring us nearer to Christ, our Supreme Head."

The Supreme Council of Bishops and the General Assembly, by a unanimous vote, authorized the Supreme Bishop to petition the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. for the gift of Apostolic Succession for the episcopate of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, and the following letter was addressed to the Presiding Bishop by the Supreme Bishop of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente :

Manila, Philippines,
August 9, 1947

To: The Most Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, D.D.
Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.
281 Fourth Avenue, New York City, U.S.A.

My Most Reverend Bishop:

The Supreme Council of Bishops and the General Assembly of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente in their sessions held respectively August 4th and 5th, 1947, in the City of Manila, with the Rt. Rev. Norman S. Binsted as our honored guest and valued adviser, have unanimously authorized the undersigned, as Supreme Head of the said Church, to prayerfully petition the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America the gift of Apostolic Succession for our Episcopate. To make feasible the granting of the blessing of Apostolic Succession to our Episcopate, the Supreme Council of Bishops and the General Assembly have unanimously passed and adopted the Articles of Faith, Articles of Religion, Constitution and Canons herein attached, and have proclaimed the same as our official doctrines and law.

Not less than two millions of Filipinos very respectfully join me in this humble invitation to the Protestant Episcopal Church of America to bestow upon us the grace of Apostolic Succession to allow our Church to remove all objections to the validity of our sacred orders and the validity of our Sacraments, and to be recognized as a young sister Church by the Anglican Communion of Churches.

We are earnestly convinced that this decision of our Church to humbly request the Apostolic Succession is a holy inspiration of the Holy Spirit, as it has been consistently one of the highest aspirations of our Episcopate since August 3rd, 1902, when our Church emancipated itself from the Church of Rome. The Rt. Rev. Norman S. Binsted, Bishop of the Episcopal Church in the Philippines, is our attesting witness to the sincerity and earnestness of our appeal to the Episcopal Church of America for the gift and blessing of Apostolic Succession.

Very humbly yours,
(Signed) ISABELO DE LOS REYES, JR., O.M.

House of Bishops Approves Petition

The House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, meeting at Winston-Salem, North Carolina, from November 4 to 7, 1947, received, considered, and approved the petition requesting valid consecration for the bishops of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, forwarded to the Presiding Bishop by the Obispo Maximo. At the request of the Presiding Bishop, the petition was presented to the House by the Missionary Bishop of the Philippines, on Wednesday, November 5, 1947. Previous to the presentation, the members of the House had been in-

formed of the details of the negotiations between the two Churches through the publicity given the matter in *The Living Church* and the September Supplement to *The Diocesan Chronicle*.

The Bishop of the Philippines, in his presentation, briefly outlined the history of the Philippine Independent Church, its theological development, and the events leading up to the forwarding of the petition, including the adoption by that Church the preceding August of an orthodox "Declaration of Faith and Articles of Religion." He stressed the fact that the approval of the petition would in no wise effect the independence of either Church. The Protestant Episcopal Church was simply asked to convey the grace of Apostolic Orders to the episcopate of the Philippine Independent Church, in accordance with the provisions of Canon 42—"Of the Consecration of Bishops for Foreign Lands." A number of pertinent questions were asked from the floor and answered by the Bishop of the Philippines and others who at some time had resided in the Islands.

The Rt. Rev. Lewis B. Whittemore, one such former resident of the Philippines, in sponsoring the petition, said,

"The Philippine Independent Church is going through a period something like our own during the Revolutionary War. This is an historic moment. We can take a remarkable step forward in the cooperation between Churches. We should act, and we should act at this session on this question."

On motion of the Bishop of Maryland, the petition was referred to a special committee of the House for study, in consultation with the Bishop of the Philippines, with instructions to report back to the House on the following day. The Presiding Bishop appointed on this committee the Rt. Rev. B. F. P. Ivins, D.D., Bishop of Milwaukee, chairman; the Rt. Rev. Edmund P. Dandridge, D.D., Bishop of Tennessee; the Rt. Rev. Lewis B. Whittemore, D.D., Bishop of Western Michigan; the Rt. Rev. Norman B. Nash, D.D., Bishop of Massachusetts; the Rt. Rev. Theodore R. Ludlow, D.D., Suffragan Bishop of Newark. The committee considered the theological implications of the petition and the feasibility of granting it under the Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The following day, Bishop Ivins, reporting for the committee, said:

"The Committee's studies convinced it that the House of Bishops had the authority to approve the petition under the Constitution and Canons of the Church and that it was in unanimous agreement in regard to it." He further stated, "The Committee felt that this is not a matter for reference to the Lambeth Conference, which would simply refer it back to us. Neither Church is seeking union now.

We would have the same fellowship of communion as we now enjoy with the Polish National Church. There were relations between the Philippine Independent Church and the International Unitarian Congress. These have now ceased."

A motion to approve the report of the committee was seconded by a number of bishops, and was carried with only one dissenting vote. It was cast by the Bishop of Southern Ohio, who later explained that he was not against granting the petition, but had voted "no" only because he thought the matter had been given insufficient study and that the House of Bishops was acting too speedily.

This historic action cleared the way for the Presiding Bishop to take orders for the consecration of three bishops of the Philippine Independent Church, who, after receiving valid consecration, could proceed with the consecration of the other members of their episcopate.

**Apostolic Orders Conferred Upon Mons. Isabelo de los Reyes, Jr.,
Obispo Maximo and Bishop of Manila and Quezon Cities;
Mons. Manuel N. Aguilar, Bishop of Laguna; and
Mons. Gerardo M. Bayaca, Bishop of Tarlac and Zambales**

The Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in recognition of the independence and national character of the Philippine Independent Church, decided that the consecration of its bishops should take place in the Philippines. He took order for the consecrations, and appointed the Rt. Rev. Norman S. Binsted, D.D., Missionary Bishop of the Philippines as consecrator; and the Rt. Rev. Robert Franklin Wilner, D.D., Suffragan Bishop of the Philippines and the Rt. Rev. Harry Sherbourne Kennedy, D.D., Missionary Bishop of Honolulu, as co-consecrators.

The consecration service was held at the Pro-Cathedral Church of St. Luke's in the city of Manila, on Wednesday, April 7, 1948, at 9:30 a.m. The testimonials were read by the Rev. Arthur H. Richardson, president of the Council of Advice of the Missionary District of the Philippines, and the Very Rev. Wayland S. Mandell served as precentor. The students of St. Andrew's Theological Seminary made up the choir, while other bishops of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente occupied seats in the chancel. Because of the limited capacity of the Pro-Cathedral, admission was by ticket. The Obispo Maximo wore the pectoral cross and ring of the late Mons. Gregorio Aglipay, which had been presented to him by the widow of Bishop Aglipay, who was present for the service. Other distinguished persons present to honor the three bishops included General Emilio Aguinaldo, Mr. Manuel Gallego, secretary of Public

Instruction, Judge and Mrs. Buenaventura Ocamp, and Mr. E. B. Rodriguez, director of the National Library.

The following statement, prepared jointly by Bishop Binsted and Mons. Isabelo de los Reyes, Jr., was printed with the order of service for the consecration:

This Service marks the end of a quest, which began even before those who founded the Iglesia Filipina Independiente severed their connections with the Roman Catholic Church. The foremost leaders of the movement, including Don Isabelo de los Reyes and Mons. Gregorio Aglipay, never intended to forfeit their Catholic heritage. It was only after efforts to win reasonable privileges for the Filipino priesthood and to bring about certain desired reforms which would secure to their people a degree of liberty of action consonant with the intellectual and political developments had failed, that they and their followers reluctantly decided to declare their independence of Papal authority and to organize a national Church.

The Church in the early days of its history was influenced by the sudden impact of scientific, philosophic, and modern religious thought, and espoused certain tenets which were later discarded as inconsistent with the Catholic faith. And, although it welcomed truth from whatever source it came, the Church generally never departed from the fundamental Catholic faith as set forth by the Ecumenical Councils of the undivided Church. The doctrinal position of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente has been clearly restated in the Declaration of Faith and the Articles of Religion unanimously approved by the General Assembly of 1947.

The Church from the time of its organization has always had the threefold Ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; but, as at that time there was no living Filipino who had been elevated to the episcopate by the Roman Catholic Church, there was none to secede with the priests and the laity and bring to the new Church Apostolic Succession, which had been retained by the historic branches of the Catholic Church, such as the Anglican, Roman, and Greek Orthodox. This deficiency was recognized at the time and overtures were made by Bishop Aglipay to the Anglican Church and the Old Catholic Church of Europe, in the hope of obtaining Apostolic consecration for himself and the other bishops of the Church. However, for various reasons, these early negotiations were never carried through, and the Church has waited until today to make up this deficiency in its Orders. Today, through the action authorized by the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., one of the Churches of the Anglican Communion, this gift of Apostolic Succession is conveyed to the Iglesia Filipina Independiente.

While the Iglesia Filipina Independiente will always cherish and maintain its independence and take pride in the record of its people in laying the foundations of national, as well as ecclesiastical independence, it rejoices that in this Service of Consecration the validity

of its Orders is secured and very close cooperation with the Episcopal Church made possible. It is expected that in the future, by action of the two Churches, a concordat may be concluded between them authorizing intercommunion. In the meantime, the Episcopal Church has welcomed into its Theological Seminary the seminarians of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, and a Commission has been appointed by the Obispo Maximo to revise the Book of Offices of the Church to bring it more in line with those used in other branches of the Catholic Church.

The Iglesia Filipina Independiente, strengthened by the blessing of Apostolic Orders, faces the future with faith and confidence, resolved to continue its work in the spirit of the Blessed Apostles for the spiritual and moral elevation of the People of the Philippines and the general welfare of the Republic.

The Iglesia Filipina Independiente Celebrates Its Golden Jubilee

The clarification of the faith of the Church through the adoption of the "Declaration of Faith and Articles of Religion" by the General Assembly and the Supreme Council of Bishops on August 5, 1947, and the validation of its orders through the consecration of its three bishops on April 7, 1948, were historic events welcomed by the whole body of the Church. With these major problems resolved, the bishops, clergy, and laity were stirred by a new fervor and optimism, to which they gave expression in their Golden Jubilee Celebration on August 2, 1952. With more than thirty thousand laity, and over three hundred bishops and clergy, in attendance, a thanksgiving Eucharist was celebrated at the Rizal Stadium, Manila, in recognition of the half-century of the life of the Church, and as an act of gratitude for the bestowal of Apostolic Orders upon the Church by the American Episcopal Church. While it is somewhat of a repetition of points already covered, we quote the following statement from the program of that service:

The Philippine Independent Church was established in 1902, when approximately three million lay members and about a hundred priests seceded from the Roman Catholic Church. . . .

The secession from Rome was on such a vast scale that the necessity for immediate organization moved Bishop Gregorio Aglipay to accept consecration as Obispo Maximo on January 18, 1903, at the hands of those who lacked regular episcopal consecration. Although he accepted such consecration on the grounds of expediency, and because the urgency of the times prevented his going to Europe for investiture at the hands of bishops of the Old Catholic Church, nevertheless, he was perfectly aware of the deficiency of his episcopal orders, and very early sought to remedy that through negotiations with the Episcopal Church of the U.S.A. and the Old Catholic Church of Europe. On June 17, 1904, he addressed a letter to the

Rt. Rev. Charles Henry Brent, D.D., requesting closer association with the Episcopal Church, and on February 24, 1905, the French Deputy to the Congress of the Old Catholic Churches of Europe, held in Berne, Switzerland, Emilio Barrell of Cheuxdes Tons, presented a petition in the name of Bishop Aglipay, as Supreme Head of the Philippine Independent Church, requesting the bestowal of Apostolic Orders. However, nothing came of either of these appeals, due to the raging political conflicts of the times in which Bishop Aglipay was actively participating, and by the complications caused by the association of the Church with the Unitarians. The delay encountered in these negotiations drove Bishop Aglipay to lean more and more on the friendship and assistance so generously proffered by the Unitarians. Several pamphlets and books published by Bishop Aglipay at this time were Unitarian in their theology. However, while the great mass of the people remained profoundly loyal to this leader, they were not influenced by his theological deflection towards Unitarianism, but tenaciously retained their Trinitarian faith. Gradually all traces of heretical teaching were eliminated, so that the Church in 1947 could issue an orthodox Declaration of Faith and Articles of Religion, unanimously approved by the Supreme Council of Bishops and the General Assembly.

The Philippine Independent Church is Catholic, reformed, and autonomous.

It is Catholic in that it has preserved the faith and order of the Church as it was set forth in the Ecumenical Councils of the undivided Church. It has always had the threefold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons; it has administered the seven sacraments, holding Baptism and Holy Communion to be generally necessary to salvation; it accepts the statement of the faith contained in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God, and that nothing which cannot be proved by the Holy Scriptures is to be held as necessary to salvation. It is to be noted that there was a brief period in the history of the Church when a reformed creed resembling, but not identical with, the ancient Catholic Creeds was authorized, but never widely used.

It is autonomous and indigenous in that its entire membership, as well as its clergy, are Filipinos, and is financially self-supporting. It has never at any time depended upon financial support or leadership from foreign sources. It has given to the people the services of the Church in their own dialects, and has been a consistent advocate of Philippine Independence. It has attracted to its fold some of the most ardent patriots of the nation. It is an autonomous Church within the Catholic Church of Christ.

It is reformed in that it abolished the abuses of indulgences, the sale of the so-called "santa bula," condemned Mariolatry, permitted the marriage of the clergy, holds that the Holy Scriptures alone are the basis of doctrine, and has renounced the claim of the Pope to universal jurisdiction, together with the doctrine of Papal Infallibility.

The Church has exerted a strong influence on the whole Christian movement in the Philippines. By its courageous stand against the autocratic power and the errors of the Roman Church, it has made the work of other Churches easier, and has been the indirect means of bringing about reforms within the Roman Church. By its fight for the recognition of the ability and rights of the Filipino priesthood, it has made no small contribution to the development of national Christian leadership in the Islands.

The prayers of all Christian people are asked for God's blessing upon the work of the Philippine Independent Church, that she may labor more abundantly for the salvation of all men.

Threat of Schism Averted by the Decision of the Civil Courts

Dissatisfaction on the part of a large majority of the clergy and laity of the Church with the leadership of Mons. Santiago Fonacier, who had been elected to succeed Mons. Gregorio Aglipay as Obispo Maximo, on October 14, 1940, resulted in a demand for his resignation by the Supreme Council of Bishops and the General Assembly on January 21 and 22, 1946, respectively, and the election of Mons. Gerardo Bayaca as his successor. Unfortunately, Mons. Fonacier declined to accept the decision of the Supreme Council and the General Assembly, and declined to turn over the official books and funds of the Church to his successor in office. This precipitated the Church into a long legal battle, which began in the Court of First Instance in Manila, on February 9, 1946, and was not terminated until a final decision was handed down by the Supreme Court of the Philippines on January 28, 1955.

Although the suit was originally filed solely to secure the transfer of certain Church properties to the duly elected Obispo Maximo, other questions were subsequently introduced by the dissident group, such as the adoption on August 5, 1947, of the "Declaration of Faith and Articles of Religion" by the major faction under the leadership of Mons. Isabelo de los Reyes, Jr., who had succeeded Mons. Bayaca as Obispo Maximo, and the acceptance of Apostolic Consecration on April 7, 1948, by Bishops de los Reyes, Jr., Aguilar, and Bayaca, at the hands of bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. The Supreme Court in its decision reaffirmed the findings of the lower courts that such matters were irrelevant and outside the jurisdiction of the civil courts. In this rather famous case, the civil courts ruled on the questions of interest to all Churches in the Philippines. To summarize them briefly, they involved (a) the right of the constituted authority, elected by the majority of an ecclesiastical body in accordance with its constitution and canons, to hold title to the property of the whole organization, and the denial of the right to retain any such titles by any dissident faction, seceding from

the main body; (b) that an ecclesiastical body has the authority to re-state, clarify, change, or modify its fundamental doctrine, rites, and ceremonies, and that (c) a Church or congregation in a foreign land, availing itself of the privilege of receiving valid consecration of its bishops from bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., in provision of that Church's Canon 42, does not thereby forfeit any of its rights or privileges as an independent ecclesiastical body, or in any way come under the jurisdiction of the Episcopal Church.

Bishop Binsted, commenting in the *Diocesan Chronicle* of March, 1955, on the final decision promulgated by the Supreme Court, said:

The issues involved were so clear-cut that at no time did we lose faith in the eventual satisfactory outcome of the litigation. The Justices of the Supreme Court, by their fair and well considered decision, have rendered a great service to the Christian movement in the Philippines, and their historic decision will doubtless be quoted when similar cases come before Civil Courts in other countries.

The Most Reverend Isabolo de los Reyes, Jr., who, as Obispo Maximo, has borne a major part of the burden of defending his Church before the Courts throughout the entire nine year period of litigation, by his Christian fortitude, patience, quiet confidence and steadfast faith has commanded the respect and admiration of the various Church groups in the Philippines.

We see in the successful termination of this suit another evidence that the Holy Spirit is directing the destinies of this great Church, which under His guidance will continue to grow in strength and influence, and as an integral part of Christ's Holy Catholic Church accomplish its mission to the honour of God and the salvation of His children. We give thanks for the fine spirit of fellowship which exists between the Philippine Independent Church and the Protestant Episcopal Church, which has been deepened during the years of adversity, and look forward with joy and expectation to ever closer co-operation in the brighter years ahead.

A Unitarian Comments on the Cooperation Between the Iglesia Filipina Independiente and the Protestant Episcopal Church⁴

"You ask me about the drawing together of the Independent Church of the Philippines and the American Episcopal Church. I regard your inquiry as a command to speak; as opportunity offers I must tell what little I know.

"For an account of the liberalism of the Independent Church and its liturgy, try to get people to read my book, *The Philippines Calling*. The Philippine life, we must remember, was terribly torn apart by the Japanese occupancy, with its tortures, its crushing of industries, and the fearful poverty which continues the destruction of

⁴ Louis C. Cornish, *Our Faith* (Unitarian), issue of January, 1948.

many of our liberal churches, including the Manila Cathedral and the Manila Divinity School. Last winter [1947] the Episcopal Church in America announced its intention to raise money for Philippine relief. When you have suffered the horrors of hell, when the need of rebuilding your churches and educating your ministers continues to be appallingly imperative, surely the certainty of help is properly persuasive. Also, as everywhere else, the intellectual life of the Filipinos has become chaotic. For example, the former Archbishop, Mons. Fonacier, now almost unanimously deposed, has become a member of a central committee of Communists, and has denied his religious beliefs, and denies all hope of immortality. All this may have influenced great numbers of people within the Independent Church toward a more conservative attitude. We must remember also that the Independent Church always has been deeply theistic and devotional.

"The Filipinos are a great people. I love them. If it shall prove that we have lost our opportunity to work with their Independent Church, many religious liberals will grieve. This has been one of the greatest opportunities our free fellowship has ever had to foster liberal Christianity.

"While the trend of events appears now to be determined, the situation is not yet wholly defined. One Church is profoundly Anglican; the other is profoundly Filipino—gloriously Filipino—perhaps the most Filipino of any institution in the Islands. What affiliation these two great Christian Communions can work out will be of importance to the entire world."

Conclusion

Mons. Isabolo de los Reyes, Jr., in concluding his notes on which much of the above is based, says :

"Today, bishops, priests, and the laity of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente are solidly united by a clearly stated Catholic and Apostolic Faith.

"Four-fifths of the faithful are humble workers of the cities and farmers in the rural barrios, with pitifully meager economic resources, while only one-fifth are from the middle classes. Only a handful might be considered wealthy. But growing and determined efforts are being exerted to teach the people the virtue of systematic and regular giving for the support of their Church. The parochial and diocesan organizations for men, women, and the youth of the Church are being brought together in national organizations. With the development of these organizations, the Church is taking at every stage a more important part in the life of the nation, endeavoring to inspire it with its own message, sharing sometimes in its mistakes, and yet always mindful of its divine mission and purpose.

"The Church is faced with incalculable problems and difficulties, but courageously steps are being taken to overcome and solve them.

The future priests are now receiving sound and full theological training at St. Andrew's Theological Seminary. More than thirty of our students are enrolled there for the five-year course, and their number is growing. Extension courses are given annually at St. Andrew's Seminary for other priests of our Church. It is upon that Seminary that the hopes for our future are built.

"One of the urgent needs is for schools and colleges under the auspices of the Church. Thousands of our young people, who, of necessity, attend Roman Catholic schools and colleges, are lost to the Church.

"A draft of a revised *Officio Divino*, or Book of Common Prayer, for the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, has been completed, and will be submitted to the 1957 meeting of the General Assembly and Supreme Council of Bishops for approval and authorization. After its authorization, it is hoped that formal negotiations may be opened with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. for intercommunion between our two Churches."

The Founding of the Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest

By William A. Clebsch*

HE story of the founding of the Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, and its accomplishments of the first seven years, makes what author-folklorist J. Frank Dobie might call a typical Texas tale—tall but true. In June 1951, the Seminary was nothing more than a gleam in the eyes of a few Episcopal Church leaders in Austin, Texas. Seven years later, it had become a full-fledged, accredited theological college of a dozen teachers and nearly a hundred students, housed in a well-equipped set of unmortgaged buildings, boasting (as such things go) of four score clergy alumni who labored in fields stretching from Massachusetts to Brazil, from Florida to Japan.

Crowded seminaries, the expiration of educational prerogatives under the G. I. Bill of Rights, recognition of a critical shortage of Episcopal clergy—in these emergency circumstances the school had its genesis, thanks to the willingness of leaders of the Diocese of Texas to take bold steps without tarrying for a clear vision of where the steps would lead, and thanks to the hospitality of a seminary of a sister denomination.

Several postulants in the spring of 1951 found themselves unable to gain admission to the overflow entering classes of the Episcopal Church's established seminaries. To delay entering upon their theological studies meant forfeiting their entitled veterans' educational benefits. Five such men were postulants of the diocese of Texas, one of Florida, one of Virginia. The office of the then bishop coadjutor of Texas was hard around the corner from the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, which operated under a contract with the United States Veterans' Administration. These postulants were enrolled in the Presbyterian Seminary for their courses, of which those in Bible, history and liturgics were taught by three presbyters of the diocese of Texas, who devoted part of their time to what was to become the first new Episcopal Church seminary to be founded in the twentieth century. The whole venture was

* The Rev. Dr. Clebsch is professor of the History and Mission of the Church, Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, Austin, Texas.—*Editor's note.*

halting and tentative at first; registration at the Presbyterian seminary was not only a way to preserve veterans' privileges, but was also a hedge against the uncertainty of the future of the new Episcopal seminary:

"Thus if we should operate for one year only, the credits of the students would be transferable to other of our Seminaries."

When classes began in September 1951, a curriculum was designed to resemble those of the seminaries of the Episcopal Church—for an established seminary might well emerge from the emergency school. Instruction in Christian education, homiletics, philosophy of religion and Greek was offered by professors of the Presbyterian seminary; because its professor of Church history was on leave of absence, and because its Bible courses were thought to differ from those usually provided Episcopal seminarians, the three Episcopal teachers taught these subjects. By that time, there were not seven but a dozen students, counting men who sought special preparation for canonical examinations and those who were uncertain about their desire to prepare for the ministry. From the start, students from the Presbyterian seminary were welcomed at lectures. By the following spring, utilization was being made of certain courses at the nearby University of Texas.¹

Before these makeshift arrangements had endured through a mild Austin winter, plans were well under way to establish a formally organized theological seminary in the diocese of Texas. In January 1952, the Bishop's Address to the 103rd Annual Council of the diocese referred to the lack of facilities in the then eleven Episcopal Church seminaries in the United States, and reported, characteristically for the late Bishop Clinton S. Quin,^{1-a}

"Having five men for whom we could find no place, we opened up one of our own—started it at Austin . . .

"Now, we have to go on. We need a Seminary in this part of the United States, even though we have men training in seven other Seminaries. Bishop Hines will give you the details. I hope I have given you the incentive to go on."²

Earlier on, in December 1951, the then dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, while preparing an article on theological education and the ministry of the Episcopal Church,³

¹ Minutes of the Board of Trustees, February 18, 1952.

^{1-a} CLINTON SIMON QUIN (1883-1956): coadjutor of Texas, 1918-1928; diocesan, 1928-1955.

² "Bishop's Address—1952," *The Diocese of Texas Journal of the 103 Annual Council, 1952* p. 50.

³ Charles L. Taylor, Jr., "Prospect for the Episcopal Ministry in the Coming Decade," *Anglican Theological Review*, XXXIV, 4 (April, 1952), p. 50.

had written to Bishop Coadjutor John E. Hines of Texas^{3-*} inquiring for details about the new Austin venture. The reply sketched out hopes and plans for a seminary serving primarily the Southwest rather than a single diocese, building upon "the fundamental theological disciplines" and expanding "its curriculum to include the many factors . . . so important to an effective ministry for the priesthood today."⁴ It was obvious that hopes were being borne out by experiences, dreams were coming to realization.

Although there were no official sanctions for the institution, the 1952 Texas Diocesan Council received a "Report of the Seminary of the Diocese of Texas," which recounted the organization of the school "with the consent and support of Bishop Quin."⁵ Acting upon a request in the address of the bishop coadjutor, that council created a canon establishing

"a Seminary for the training of those preparing for leadership in the Church, to be known as the 'Seminary of the Southwest,' an instrumentality of the Diocese and [sic] shall be operated subject to the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese."⁶

The canon specified that the board of trustees of the seminary might include bishops, clergy, laymen or laywomen of other dioceses, but all officers of the trustees were to be communicants of the diocese of Texas.

After the seminary had thus become an official institution by action of the council, Dean Taylor's article on the training of Episcopal Church ministers gave the first general recognition to the project on which the Texans were laboring. Reprints of the article later were circulated to win friends for the endeavor. The recognition supplied guidance for later developments as well as initial encouragement, urging that the Texas seminary should become "a project of the whole Church," and that it should "grow to the status of an accredited member of the American Association of Theological Schools."⁷

The Seminary Board of Trustees lost little time, after their creation, in meeting on February 18, 1952, to hear reports on the school's progress, to organize for business, and to lay down specific proposals for future development. They were told how the school began in a rented house as a "base of operations," how the school had operated for five months on an income of somewhat less than five thousand dollars and expenditures of almost three thousand. The chairman of the board, noting that

^{3-*} JOHN ELBRIDGE HINES: coadjutor of Texas, 1945-1955; diocesan, since 1955.

⁴ John E. Hines to Charles L. Taylor, Jr., January 14, 1952, files of the dean's office, Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest.

⁵ *Diocese of Texas Journal . . . 1952*, p. 136.

⁶ *Diocese of Texas Journal . . . 1952*, p. 43.

⁷ Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 68f.

Bishop Quin had contemplated a seminary in Texas soon after World War II but that only in 1951 had the time struck for action, pointed out that the new school should depend upon the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary no longer than absolutely necessary, lest the accreditation of the older seminary be jeopardized. It was indicated that a full-time faculty for the Seminary of the Southwest must be engaged, to be recruited either by the subsidizing of graduate study of young men who showed promise as future teachers, by raiding the faculties of other seminaries, or by recruiting qualified teachers from the parish ministry.⁸ At the subsequent meeting in May 1952, the trustees turned their attention to policies regarding the admission of students, resolving that no student "should be disqualified solely on the basis of color or race."⁹ Thus, before the end of its first academic year, the Seminary of the Southwest, while far from certain of its ability to maintain itself as a permanent operation, was nevertheless a realized accomplishment with firm resolution and some detailed plans to consolidate and expand.

In seven years, the accomplishments have outstripped by far the dreams and hopes formulated during the initial academic year. Materially, the institution has received benefactions which would seem to insure its permanence of operation. Academically, the external mark of accreditation has been the token of internal gains of unity of purpose and procedure.

Late in 1952, a five-acre tract of land in the heart of the city of Austin, in the neighborhood of the University of Texas and of the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, was given to the seminary by Dr. and Mrs. Ernest J. Villavaso, and Dr. Frederic Duncalf and the late Mrs. Duncalf, in memory of the late Ernest Joseph Villavaso, Jr. On this land have been erected, at the cost of approximately one million dollars, two dormitories, a library, a classroom and faculty office building, and an administration building. Construction of a chapel has been authorized by the board of trustees. The buildings have been paid for by funds received through private donations, the Diocese of Texas, and the "Builders for Christ" campaign of the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Endowment moneys have been received for professorial chairs, scholarships and operating expenses. Current donations, including the annual Theological Education offerings, have become a major item in the seminary's operating budget.

On the academic side, the student body has increased from the

⁸ Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, February 18, 1952; actually all these methods were employed in recruiting a faculty.

⁹ Minutes of the Board of Trustees, May 3, 1952.

original handful to nearly a hundred, and the faculty from the initial three to a dozen. Independence from the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, accomplished after the first year, has allowed the two schools to be drawn into intimate cooperation on a number of academic projects. At the earliest possible date, full accreditation was achieved with the American Association of Theological Schools. The Joint Commission on Theological Education of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church has recognized the seminary as an accredited theological school of the Episcopal Church. After early experimentation, a curriculum of theological study has taken the form of a unitary course in the disciplines of scripture, history, doctrine, ethics, liturgics, and pastoralia, leading to the bachelor's and master's degrees in course. A program of study in Latin American missions has come to be offered through the cooperation of the Institute of Latin American Studies of the University of Texas. Various educational conferences and institutes were offered in conjunction with other agencies, especially the Council of Southwest Theological Schools, of which our seminary was a charter member. A rapidly growing theological library, numbering in 1958 approximately 20,000 volumes, has been enriched by the housing in the library building of the collections of archives and books of the Church Historical Society, and by the donation of the private library of Charles L. Black of Austin, primarily a collection of English literature and history.

The Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest has come into being during a decade in which serious, critical attention was given to the endeavor of theological education and ministerial training, not only in North America where notable studies have been made by a commission under the direction of Professor H. R. Niebuhr of Yale University, but all over the world.¹⁰ A generally heightened self-consciousness about theological education has pervaded the atmosphere breathed by the planners and builders of the school. Meanwhile, a burgeoning cultural confidence in the southwestern United States has nourished and refreshed the energies of the persons who have brought the institution into being. Both these circumstances have influenced the school's recent statement of its purpose:

¹⁰ See for example: K. R. Bridston, *Theological Training in the Modern World* (Geneva: World's Student Christian Federation, 1954); *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives*, edited by H. R. Niebuhr and D. D. Williams (New York: Harper, 1956); H. R. Niebuhr, *The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry* (New York: Harper, 1956) and *Advancement of Theological Education* (New York: Harper, 1957); also, studies of certain problems of ministerial training have been conducted for the Russell Sage Foundation by Professor Samuel Blizzard now of Princeton Theological Seminary.

The task of the Church in every time and place is to bear witness to the revelation of God. The purpose of the Seminary is to serve the Church in its task by elucidating both this revelation and the contemporary world to which the Church must speak. It is the aim of the Seminary to lead students and faculty into an awareness of the judgment of irrelevance which contemporary culture has brought against the Church's life of thought, worship and action. But it is also its intention to make its contribution to a Church which, appreciatively and penitently understanding this judgment, may become a fit and open vessel for God's revelation of how He is relevantly to be known, worshipped, obeyed, and proclaimed by His people in this present age.

The Seminary carries out its purpose as a community of critical inquiry, in which the testimony to God's revelation, the character of contemporary culture, and the Church's obedience to its vocation are opened to scrutiny and evaluation. In regular corporate worship, this community offers daily to God's praise its intellectual endeavors, begs His blessing upon the common life of the society in which the community participates, and holds the task of the Seminary under the judgment of Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life.

Admission to the Seminary is initiation into such a community. Since our purpose has the mission of the Church as its context, preparation of men for the ordained ministry is an indispensable function of the Seminary . . .

Wherever there is curiosity about the world, such a community has both something to say and even more to learn. Recognition of this has led to the development of a cooperative relationship with the libraries and personnel at the University of Texas and the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary. . . . In addition, opportunity is given for exploring the frontiers of investigation in other disciplines of thought and social research by means of a program of visits to the Seminary by outstanding representatives from the many diverse fields of intellectual and social endeavor, and of planned field trips to social and industrial agencies.

The Seminary welcomes applications for admission from all who desire and are qualified to enter into the discipline required by the governing purposes of the community's life.¹¹

¹¹ Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, *The Seminary Catalogue 1958-59*, pp. 10f.

THIS IS CONVERSION

By Joost de Blank

Archbishop of Capetown

"Conversion is the point of God's redemptive action in Christ—a Conversion that includes Baptism, Commitment, Decisions, Growth, Transformation. It is a Conversion we experience today but which will not be completed till that day when what Christ has done for me is one with what Christ has done in me."—Joost de Blank \$1.25

BELIEVING

A new look at the Nicene Creed

By Canon Herbert Waddams

In this book Canon Waddams shows that the Nicene Creed, the foundation document of the Christian Faith, is not only a reasonable but an indispensable document for understanding the meaning of the Christian message. It safeguards the essential teaching of Jesus and sheds light on Christian basic beliefs. \$2.15

KIRKBRIDE CONVERSATIONS

Introducing Canon Kirkbride

By Harry Blamires

Six dialogues of the Christian Faith by the author of "The Will and the Way," "Cold War in Hell" and other books. The author provides a number of lively conversations with believable characters on a variety of pertinent subjects and vexing problems. (Current Episcopal Book Club selection) \$2.50

HOW TO FACE DEATH

By Cecil Clark

This book is intended to help you with some assurance that the act of dying is not all that terrible, and that Christian belief about death and what happens afterwards is reasonably simple, straightforward and understandable. \$1.15

(Postage paid on cash orders)

MOREHOUSE-GORHAM CO.

14 E. 41st Street, New York 17, N.Y. 29 E. Madison Street, Chicago 2, Ill.
261 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco 2, Calif.

Four Diocesan Histories

*Which Are a Credit to the Authors, the Dioceses Concerned,
and the Church at Large*

The Anglican Church in New Jersey

By Nelson R. Burr

"**D**R. BURR has produced one of the best pieces of historical writing in the whole range of American Church History."—Canon GEORGE E. DEMILLE, author of *A History of the Diocese of Albany*.

\$10.00

A History of the Diocese of Albany

By George E. DeMille

"**D**E MILLE'S history rates very high by these standards which I have ventured to propose. . . . May other dioceses be as fortunate in their historians."—Prof. E. R. HARDY, Berkeley Divinity School.

\$2.50

The Anglican Church in Delaware

By Nelson W. Rightmyer

"**T**HIS volume is excellent. I read every word of it at once upon its arrival. Congratulations for another worthy publication."—Prof. MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR., *Church Divinity School of the Pacific*.

\$3.00

Virginia's Mother Church

By George MacLaren Brydon

Volume I: 1607-1727

"**M**ASSIVE learning has gone into this book. . . . Without question it is the standard book on its subject."—Prof. ALEXANDER C. ZABRISKIE, *Virginia Theological Seminary*.

\$7.50

Volume II: 1727-1814

"**W**ITHOUT this book, the history of Virginia in the colonial and Revolutionary periods could not be understood." H. J. ECKENRODE, author of *Separation of Church and State in Virginia*.

\$10.00

CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY • 606 RATHERVUE PL.
AUSTIN, TEXAS

The Story of the Christian Church



By **WINTHROP S. HUDSON**

Past President of The American Society of Church History

Written by an outstanding church historian, this book is one of the best introductions obtainable in layman's language to the nineteen-century-long pilgrimage of the Christian church.

"It is an admirable piece of work, both in content and format. Just this kind of brief, pointed guide is needed. Main ideas and events stand out and the story moves with clarity and crispness. I hope the book will have the wide circulation it richly deserves."

—LEFFERTS A. LOETSCHER, Director of Graduate Studies,
Princeton Theological Seminary.

In the course of the book, each major religious grouping may be discovered in its origins and development. Dr. Hudson has been most careful never to slight an important issue, nor to slur over a difficult one.



With 24 illustrations from old prints and woodcuts
At your bookseller. \$2.50. HARPER & BROTHERS, N.Y. 16

For Better Parish and Diocesan Histories!

"*Adventures in Parish History*, by Dr. Nelson R. Burr, ought to be required reading for anyone attempting to write a local church history, whether on the diocesan or the parish level."

—CANON
GEORGE E. DEMILLE.

Publication No. 25

The Copy, 25c

CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

606 Rathervue Place
Austin 5, Texas

The H. W. Gray Co., Inc.

"Leading Publishers of Music
for the Episcopal Church"

Agents for:
The Plainchant Publications
Committee London, England
(Edited by Francis Burgess)

~
The St. Dunstan Edition
of Plainchant
(Edited by Winfred Douglas)

~
Novello & Co., Ltd., London

~
S. Bornemann, Paris, France

~
159 East 48th St.
New York 17, N. Y.

1820-1957

*A Historical Account of
The Protestant Episcopal
Church
in South Carolina*

By The Right Reverend
ALBERT SIDNEY THOMAS, LL.D., D.D., S.T.D.
Retired Bishop of South Carolina

IN 1820, the Rev. Frederick Dalcho, M.D., Assistant Rector of St. Michael's Church, Charleston, published "*A Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South Carolina*." Now, Bishop Thomas, a former Rector of St. Michael's, has continued where Dr. Dalcho left off. The result is a highly scholarly volume of immense value and interest, not only to Churchmen, both within and without South Carolina, but to all historical-minded persons and book collectors.

THIS monumental volume of 879 pages covers the history of the two South Carolina dioceses. Included are biographies of the thirteen Bishops; lists of all the clergy who have served the Church in the state, with the dates they served; further appendices cover conventions, diocesan officers, organizations, camps and conferences, and periodicals. In addition to the text, there are 33 pages of excellent photographs of representative churches and of the Bishops. A thorough index follows.

THE book shows the care and diligent research which has occupied Bishop Thomas so many years. It is of inestimable value to scholars and to the Church.

\$7.50 post paid

**THE DIOCESAN HOUSE
138 WENTWORTH STREET
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA**



The General Convention Offices and Officers 1785-1950



Every person interested in the General Convention should own and read this book. "It is the first attempt at such a compilation, and it is a very successful one."—Bishop

WALTER H. GRAY, of Connecticut.

By C. Rankin Barnes, D. D.

Secretary of the General Convention



PUBLICATION NO. 33

\$3.00

THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

606 Rathervue Place

Austin 5, Texas

ONE CHRIST ONE WORLD ONE CHURCH

*A Short Introduction to
the Ecumenical Movement*

By NORMAN VICTOR HOPE
Professor of Church History
Princeton Theological Seminary

A Review

"THE PROFESSOR of Church History at Princeton Theological Seminary provides an excellent popular introduction to the ecumenical movement and its significance. Indeed, his is the only treatment which covers the whole development from Edinburgh, 1910, to Amsterdam, 1948. The little book makes pleasant reading. It gives just the information which the thoughtful layman or average minister wants, without burdening him with organizational detail."

— *The Religious Book Club Bulletin*

PUBLICATION No. 37

PAGES 96

THE COPY, \$1.00

Order from

THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY
606 Rathervue Place, Austin, Texas

N o w R e a d y !

The Diocese of California

A Quarter Century

1915-1940

By

EDWARD LAMBE PARSONS
Retired Bishop of California

BISHOP Parsons is one of the great bishops and one of the great scholars of his generation. He is a national figure in the fields of Prayer Book Revision, Church Unity, and Christian Social Justice. This is the story of his own Diocese, of which he was the Bishop Coadjutor, 1919-1924, and the Bishop, 1924-1940.

Publication No. 46

\$3.00



Order from

THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

606 Rathervue Place, Austin 5, Texas

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

A MINIATURE HISTORY

By WALTER H. STOWE

Historiographer of the Church



The Copy, 25c

"A brilliant survey (in 64 pages) of the relationship of this Church to the historic Church of the English race and to the worldwide Anglican Communion, and of its history from its feeble colonial beginnings down to the present, together with a brief concluding appraisal of its place in the contemporary religious scene and the distinctive values which it has to contribute to America and the world."—Dr. E. H. ECKEL, *Rector, Trinity Church, Tulsa, Oklahoma.*

HIGHLIGHTS OF CHURCH HISTORY

Early & Medieval

By RICHARD G. SALOMON

*Professor of Church History
Bexley Hall, Kenyon College*

THE COPY, 25c

The Reformation

By POWEL MILLS DAWLEY

*Professor of Ecclesiastical History
The General Theological Seminary*

THE COPY, 25c

"I want to tell you how very much I like the two brochures of Dr. Salomon and Dr. Dawley. At long last I have something on Church History which I can conscientiously put into a layman's hands. So much of this sort of thing has been apologetic and biased, without letting the facts—all of them—speak for themselves. Also they look attractive and readable. I am spreading the news about them to all my friends in the parochial ministry." Dr. MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, Jr., *Professor of Liturgics, The Church Divinity School of the Pacific.*

THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

606 Rathervue Place

Austin 5, Texas

THE CHURCH'S SEMINARIES

Are Indispensable to Its Life and Growth

1817 THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
CHELSEA SQUARE
NEW YORK 11, NEW YORK

1823 THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

1823 BEXLEY HALL
THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF KENYON COLLEGE
CAMBRIDGE, OHIO

1842 NASHOTAH HOUSE
NASHOTAH, WISCONSIN

1854 BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL
140 PROSPECT STREET
NEW HAVEN 11, CONNECTICUT

1857 THE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN PHILADELPHIA
4205 SPRUCE STREET
PHILADELPHIA 4, PENNSYLVANIA

1858 SEABURY-WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
600 HAVEN STREET
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

1867 EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL
99 BRATTLE STREET
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

1873 THE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH
SEWANEE, TENNESSEE

1893 CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC
2451 RIDGE ROAD
BERKELEY 5, CALIFORNIA

1951 THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
OF THE SOUTHWEST
606 RATHBURN PLACE
AUSTIN 5, TEXAS

Catalogues and other information can be had from the Deans.

Aid Clergy Pensions and Reduce Expenses

▼ *Here are 3 simple methods*

The Church Life Insurance Corporation



Low premium cost life insurance for the clergy, lay, officials and workers of the Church, and their immediate families. A variety of policies to meet your individual needs. Write our Programming Service.

The Church Fire Insurance Corporation



Insurers and advisors exclusively for Episcopal Church properties—covering fire—extended coverage—vandalism—fine arts—theft—glass—personal property floaters for clergy—premiums payable quarterly at savings up to twenty per cent. No interest charges. Church AGENCY Corporation—Fidelity bonds—boiler insurance—general liability—compensation—at advantageous terms.

The Church Hymnal Corporation



Publisher of all church editions of the Book of Common Prayer and the Hymnal, and other books, including the popular Prayer Book Studies series. The books are of fine quality, the prices surprisingly low. As with all the "Church" companies, profits accrue to The Church Pension Fund.

all affiliated with
the Church Pension Fund
20 Exchange Place New York 5, N. Y.

